International Journal of Cancer Management
Volume 14 · Issue 12 · e116421

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Immunohistochemical Evaluation of Transforming Growth Factor-β Expression in Oral Lichen Planus

Narges Ghazi, Nasrollah Saghravanian, Ala Ghazi, Mohammad Ghadirifard

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
13 Jun 2021	26 Dec 2021	28 Dec 2021	10.5812/ijcm-116421

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission Referee 1 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 Revision 2 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 Revision 3 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 13

1 Original submission

1 comment · 6 Aug 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 6 Aug 2021

I appreciate the researchers' valuable work. In my view, the manuscript needs some minor revision as follows:
1- In the title, TGF-beta should be written out in full rather than abbreviated.
2- The keyword Immunohistochemical panel is not a MESH keyword. It would be better to replace it with Immunohistochemistry.
3- Some parts of the manuscript lack proper citations and references (line numbers 74 to 80 and 66 to 69).
4- Verify the method used to calculate the sample size.
5- The references for laboratory methods are not clear.
6- The criteria for dysplasia are not defined and must be cited.
7- In the discussion, the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research must be mentioned.
8- In the introduction and discussion, some paragraphs are the same and must not be repeated (line numbers 108-109).
9- In line number 106, P=0.041 is greater than the significance level. It seems that it is not significant.
10- In the conclusion (line number 162), TGF-B is not introduced as a marker of chronic inflammatory conditions. Therefore, an explanatory paragraph in the introduction seems mandatory.
11- Most references are later than 2016; it would be better to replace the old ones with newer ones.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewers' Comments:

We would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive and valuable comments which helped us to improve and carefully revise the manuscript. Below you find our point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments. Finally, we believe that our manuscript after careful revision is suitable for publication.

Response to reviewer 1:

Thank you very much for your valuable comments. The manuscript has been revised in compliance with recommendations

1- We thank the reviewer for raising this point; sample size has been calculated according to the paper entitled "Chaiyarit P , Thongprasom K, Satayut S, Dhanuthai K, et al. Alteration of the Expression of CD44 Isoforms in Oral Epithelia and Saliva from Patients with Oral Lichen Planus. Journal of Clinical Immunology 2008 ;28:26-34." Reference was added to the text (15).

2- We have included ethical code in the method section (which is highlighted)

3- According to the reviewer's suggestion, exclusion criteria has been mentioned in the method section.

4-As recommended, references has been updated.

5- As suggested, we have recommended further research in the conclusion part.

6- English editing has been performed.

Response to reviewer 2:

Thank you very much for your valuable comments. The manuscript has been revised in compliance with recommendations

1- In the title: TGF-beta is written completely not in abbreviation.

2- According to the reviewer's suggestion, the keyword "Immunohistochemical panel" is replaced by "Immunohistochemistry".

3- Proper citation has been provided (which is highlighted).

4- Sample size has been calculated according to the paper entitled " Chaiyarit P , Thongprasom K, Satayut S, Dhanuthai K, et al. Alteration of the Expression of CD44 Isoforms in Oral Epithelia and Saliva from Patients with Oral Lichen Planus. Journal of Clinical Immunology 2008 ;28:26-34". Reference was added to the text.

5- Reference 7 is for method part which is mentioned in the text.

6-The criteria for histopathological evaluation was according to the references 1 and 16 which is mentioned in the manuscript.

7- Suggestions for the future research has been mentioned in discussion section which is highlighted.

8- As suggested, the same paragraph (line number: 108-109) has been corrected.

9- As mentioned in material and method the significance level was considered to be $P< 0.05$. It has been highlighted in the method part.

10- As reviewer suggested" TGF-B as a marker associated with inflammatory processes in chronic inflammatory conditions" was also mentioned in the introduction part.

11-New references has been added in the text (which are highlighted).

Response to reviewer 3:

Thank you very much for your valuable comments. The manuscript has been revised in compliance with recommendations

1- We thank the reviewer for raising this point; the EMT process is explained more clearly in the introduction part which is highlighted. Two references are also added to the paper (#9 and 10).

2- Each TGF-β –stained slide was evaluated by two of the authors (Pathologists) as independent observers. This is mentioned in the Method part.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer's Comments:

We would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive and valuable comments which helped us to improve and carefully revise the manuscript. Below you find our point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments. Finally, we believe that our manuscript after careful revision is suitable for publication.

Response to reviewer 1:

Thank you very much for your valuable comments. The manuscript has been revised in compliance

with recommendations

1. *The references for WHO guideline must be change to main article about this guideline.*

As recommended, references has been changed according to the guideline

2. *Exclusion criteria is not completed. For example as we know a significantly high prevalence of thyroid disease among OLP patients has been observed. Other diseases of altered immunity, particularly alopecia areata, ulcerative colitis, vitiligo, morphea, myasthenia gravis, occur more frequently in patients with LP. Patients with lichen planus present a higher risk for dyslipidaemia, which could be explained by the cytokines involved in the pathogenesis of the disease. So were these patient excluded or not? This example and other exclusion criteria should be mentioned.*

We thank the reviewer for raising this point; completed exclusion criteria has been provided in the method section (which is highlighted). Subjects with presence of systemic illness, and history of having systemic illness were excluded.

3. *On line 21 consideredto must be written separately.*

As suggested, it has been corrected.

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

With greetings and respect,

The corrections requested by the reviewers were made one by one and applied in the text of the article.

Thank you,

Reviewer 1:

1) The study was conducted on three groups, so mentioning the sex ratio and mean age of the total sample has no value; this sentence should be rewritten

According to the respected reviewer's comment, the sentence in question was rewritten. (The changes are highlighted)

2) Between two groups or three groups?

With thanks to the respected reviewer, the sentence in question was corrected (three groups is meant)

3) Which test was used should be added to the methods section.

The chi-square test was used for the statistical analysis. According to the respected reviewer's comment, the test was mentioned in the methods section and highlighted

4) Although the titles of the tables are different, the variables of the tables are similar; please check again

P-values should be added to the tables

The variables of the tables were checked again and, according to the respected reviewer's comment, P-values were added to the tables

4 Revision 3

0 comments

No public comments in this round.