International Journal of Cancer Management
Volume 17 · Issue 1 · e147132

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Suppression of Glioblastoma Proliferation by Inducing Oxidative Stress via Modulation of TXNDC12 Expression

Yuying Zhang, Juanyu Ma, Haiyan Li, Zhaohui Yan

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
30 Mar 2024	16 Jul 2024	27 Jul 2024	10.5812/ijcm-147132

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** Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

1 comment · 1 Jul 2024

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 1 Jul 2024

This manuscript describes a study on expression analysis of TXNDC12 in glioblastoma as a therapeutic target. The manuscript is well-written and the topic of research is interesting. Points to consider are:

1. Please make the abstract structured.
2. In the manuscript body, the method section should be after the introduction section.
3. The conclusion section of the manuscript should be a separate paragraph at the end of the discussion section.
4. Omit the letter written to the "ACS Chemical Neuroscience" journal.

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.

Response to reviewers' comments:
We are grateful for the constructive feedback from the reviewers. According to these suggestions, we have provided additional data to validate our conclusion. The manuscript has been substantially revised. Below, please find our point-by-point responses to the reviewers' comments.

Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:
In this study, the authors assessed the significance of the sulfoxide-domain-containing protein 12 (TXNDC12) in upholding the oxidation-reduction equilibrium within GBM cells. This study has two different independent sections: Bioinformatics and experimental (in vitro and in vivo) part.
It seems that this study has many novelties that performed with acceptable quality, but the authors should address some revisions before publication.
1. In the introduction section, especially at the end, the authors insert some results and especially the conclusion, which should be revised to the usual style of introduction.
A: Thank you for pointing this out. We have revised the introduction to adhere to the conventional format by removing specific results and conclusions. The revised introduction will focus on providing background information, highlighting the significance of TXNDC12 in GBM, and stating the objectives of our study without disclosing specific findings.

2. line 127: Therefore, the high expression of TXNDC12 played ….. This sentence should be revised to a more meaningful one.
A: We appreciate your suggestion. We have revised the sentence to: " Therefore, the overexpression of TXNDC12 was indicative of a poor prognosis in GBM, pointing to its significance in tumor biology and the potential benefits of targeting TXNDC12 in therapeutic approaches to mitigate disease progression."

3. In the entire article (results and methods section), the bioinformatics and experimental parts are mixed, which could distract the readers. It would be strongly suggested to separate these parts from each other to increase the uptake of the readers.
A: We acknowledge this concern and will restructure the manuscript to clearly separate the bioinformatics and experimental sections. In the revised manuscript, the Methods section is first described the bioinformatics analyses, followed by the experimental (in vitro and in vivo) procedures. Thank you again for your kind suggestions.

4. Line 241 to 247: The authors should remove or displace the conclusion paragraph from the result section to the end of the discussion part.
A: Thank you for your comments, we have revised this section. Specifically, we have streamlined the original paragraph to read "In sum, the downregulation of TXNDC12 effectively inhibits the growth of glioblastoma multiforme (GBM) tumors in vivo." This adjustment will ensure that the Results section focuses on the findings, while the

Discussion section will synthesize these findings and provide a concluding perspective.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

This manuscript describes a study on expression analysis of TXNDC12 in glioblastoma as a therapeutic target. The manuscript is well-written and the topic of research is interesting. Points to consider are:

1. Please make the abstract structured.

A: We appreciate this suggestion. We have rewritten the Abstract in a revised manuscript, and we have further revised the language to make this section clearer and more readable.

2. In the manuscript body, the method section should be after the introduction section.

A: Thank you for your input. We have repositioned the Methods section to follow the Introduction section to ensure proper structure and flow in the manuscript.

3. the conclusion section of the manuscript should be as a seperate paragraph at the end of the discussion section.

A: We agree with this recommendation. We have created a separate Conclusion section at the end of the Discussion part to provide a clear and distinct summary of our findings.

4. Omit the letter which is written to the "ACS Chemical Neuroscience" Journal.

A: We are very sorry for the accident caused by our carelessness. In the revised Cover Letter, we have carefully revised and checked to avoid similar mistakes and we have summarized our improvements. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 24 Jul 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 24 Jul 2024

Dear Editor-in-chief,

The authors have revised their manuscript according to the reviewers' comments. The manuscript is ready to be accepted for publication.