International Journal of Cancer Management
Volume 17 · Issue 1 · e143873

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Pre-transplant Predictive Factors in Multiple Myeloma Patients Undergoing Autologous Stem Cell Transplantation Using Defective Cure Models

Leila Jabari Nanva, Ahmad Reza Baghestani, Dariush Kadkhoda, Ali Akbar Khadem Maboudi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 Feb 2024	2 Dec 2024	4 Dec 2024	10.5812/ijcm-143873

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** Mohammad Houshyari 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Mohsen of Allied Medical Hamidpour 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9
4 **Revision 3** 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

1 comment · 2 Jul 2024

Mohammad Houshyari Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Jul 2024

Comments:

1. Main title: To make the title concise, it is suggested to omit "(Inverse Gaussian and Kumaraswamy Inverse Gaussian)".
2. Abstract: "In the present study, the analysis of
prognostic factors of autologous transplantation in patients with myeloma" Given that the aim is to find the factors predicting response to transplantation, it is suggested to use "predictive factors" instead of "prognostic factors". This change needs to be considered in the main title: "Cure Fraction and Effective Predictive Factors of Autologous Transplantation in Multiple Myeloma
Using Defective Cure Models".
3. Abstract: "The inverse Gaussian model showed that the age of the patients and the number of platelets were significant factors". Kindly add the time point of the "platelet counting".
4. Abstract_conclusion: This needs to be revised to contain clear, concise, practical information pertaining to the study findings. There is no place in the Conclusions to note the findings in the KM curve.
5. Methods: Kindly add information about ethical issues (approval, Helsinki declarations, patients' consents).
6. Methods: Add details of the study type.
7. The manuscript requires substantial copy editing. For example, "Error! Reference source not found.." appears in the Results_2nd paragraph.
8. Results: "The mean OS was 7.75[CI:6.74-8.76] years." Is this a 95% confidence interval? Kindly add this information.
9. The Discussion section requires substantial revision. It must start with the main study findings and discuss the importance of the findings with a comparison to similar literature.
10. Discussion: Kindly add the study limitations, strengths, and suggestions for future work.
11. Reference style should follow the journal guidelines. Using mere links to the source is not acceptable.

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.

Greetings and Regards

1. Main title: to make the title concise, it is suggested to omit the "(Inverse Gaussian and Kumaraswamy Inverse Gaussian"

The title, "Inverse Gaussian and Inverse Gaussian Coomaraswamy" was removed and the title was changed to **“Cure Fraction and Effective Predictive Factors of Autologous Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation in Multiple Myeloma Using Defective Cure Models”**

2. Abstract: "In the present study, the analysis of prognostic factors of autologous transplantation in patients with myeloma" Given the aim is to find the factors predicting response to the transplantation, it is suggested to use "predictive factors" instead of "prognostic factors". This change needs to be considered in the main title: "Cure Fraction and Effective Predictive Factors of Autologous Transplantation in Multiple Myeloma Using Defective Cure Models".

Instead of "prognostic factors," the article utilized "predictive factors" in the main title and other sections.

3. Abstract: "The inverse Gaussian model showed that the age of the patients and the number of platelets were significant factors". Kindly add the time point of the "platelet counting".

The number of platelets was changed to "platelet count of pre-transplantation".

4. Abstract_ Conclusion: needs to be revised to contain clear, concise, practical information pertaining the study findings. There is no place in the Conclusions to note the findings in the KM curve.

The text has been revised to ensure it contains clear, concise, and practical information related to the study findings.

5. Methods: Kindly add the information about ethical issues (approval, Helsinki declarations, patients' consents)

In the methods section, we included information about ethical issues.

6. Methods: add the details of the study type details.

The type of study, which was a retrospective cohort, and other details of the study type, were added.

7. The manuscript requires substantial copy editing. For example, "Error! Reference source not found." in the Results_2nd paragraph.

The reference was corrected.

8. Results" "The mean OS was 7.75[CI:6.74-8.76] years." is it 95% confidence interval? kindly add.

This means that the 95% confidence interval was placed in the text.

9. The Discussion section requires substantial revision. It must start with the main study findings and discuss their importance, comparing them to similar literature.

The discussion section was revised. The study's main findings were placed at the beginning, and the significance of the findings was compared with similar literature.

10. Discussion: Kindly add the study limitations, strengths, and suggestions for the future works.

Limitations, strengths, and study suggestions for future work are added.

11. Reference style should follow the journal guidelines. Using mere links to the source is not acceptable.

According to the journal guidelines, the reference style was modified.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 9 Nov 2024 – 15 Nov 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

REJECT 9 Nov 2024

A similar article titled "Long-term Survival of Multiple Myeloma Patients using Cure Models" from a similar institution (Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences) has recently been published in the Archives of Advances in Biosciences journal (link: https://journals.sbmu.ac.ir/aab/article/view/43103).
Overall, I recommend rejecting this article.

Mohsen of Allied Medical Hamidpour Reviewer

ACCEPT 15 Nov 2024

Subject: The article uses the statistical formula to predict MM, so this can be a novel aspect of the article.

Title: It is suggested that "Predictive Factors in Multiple Myeloma patients " be used instead of diagnostic factor in the title and main subject.

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.

Greetings and regards

Reviewer 1:
A similar article titled "Long-term Survival of Multiple Myeloma Patients using Cure Models" from a similar institution (Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences) have been recently published in the Archives of Advances in Biosciences journal (link: https://journals.sbmu.ac.ir/aab/article/view/43103). Surprisingly, both articles have a similar ethical code.
Overall, I recommend to reject this article

1-Both articles are based on a thesis, which includes an ethics code for both.

The survival time analyzed in the previous article was measured from the time of diagnosis until the patient's death. In contrast, the current article examines the time from pre-transplantation to death. As a result, the number of samples and the patient information used for the survival time analysis differ between the two studies.

3- In the previous article, we introduced and compared four cure models: Inverse Gaussian, Kumaraswamy, Gompertz, and Inverse Kumaraswamy-Gompertz, using data from patients with multiple myeloma. Based on the results, only two models—the Inverse Kumaraswamy and Inverse Gaussian—showed a higher level of accuracy in determining the cure fraction and overall survival time for these patients. Consequently, this article focuses on examining these two models in greater detail and investigating the predictive factors associated with them, based on the variables gathered from pre-transplant tests.

As stated in the discussion and objectives sections, this article continues the findings presented in the previous article.

Reviewer 2:
Subject: the article uses the statistical formula to predict the MM, so it can be a novelty for this article.

The discussion section addressed the novelty of statistical models in identifying predictive factors that affect survival time.

Title changed to

"Predictive Factors in Multiple Myeloma patients Using Defective Cure Models "

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.

Greetings and regards

Reviewer 1:
A similar article titled "Long-term Survival of Multiple Myeloma Patients Using Cure Models" from a similar institution (Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences) have been recently published in the Archives of Advances in Biosciences journal (link: https://journals.sbmu.ac.ir/aab/article/view/43103). Surprisingly, both articles have a similar ethical code.
Overall, I recommend to reject this article

Regarding the reviewer's comment, it is a natural phenomenon that the authors are allowed to republish their article as a long period follow-up or more patients are investigated, the only issue that they have to announce is writing the matter in the new article. They must state that this is a continuation of the previously published article. For this purpose, it was said in the Material and Method section and Discussion section that this article is a continuation of the findings presented in the previous article that examined pre-transplant predictive factors affecting survival time.

The survival time analyzed in the previous article was measured from diagnosis until the patient's death. In contrast, the current article examines the time from pre-transplantation to death. As a result, the number of samples and the patient information used for the survival time analysis differ between the two studies.

In the previous article, we introduced and compared four cure models: Inverse Gaussian, Kumaraswamy, Gompertz, and Inverse Kumaraswamy-Gompertz, using data from patients with multiple myeloma. Based on the results, only two models—the Inverse Kumaraswamy and Inverse Gaussian—showed higher accuracy in determining the cure fraction and overall survival time for these patients. Consequently, this article focuses on examining these two models in greater detail and investigating their associated predictive factors, based on the variables gathered from pre-transplant tests.

Both articles are based on a thesis, which includes an ethics code for both.

Reviewer 2:
Subject: The article uses the statistical formula to predict the MM, so it can be a novelty for this article.

The discussion section addressed the novelty of statistical models in identifying predictive factors that affect survival time.

Title changed to

" **Pre-transplant Predictive Factors in Multiple Myeloma Patients Undergoing Autologous Stem Cell Transplantation Using Defective Cure Models**"

The Associate Editor's comments were revised in the manuscript placed in the Materials and Method section and highlighted.

4 Revision 3

0 comments

No public comments in this round.