Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 32 · Issue 1 · e115502

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluating Methotrexate Toxicity and Its Association with ABCB1 Genetic Polymorphism in Children with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia

farima zakaryaei, Ebrahim Mohammadi, Ebrahim Ghaderi, Fatemeh Zamani, Borhan Moradveisi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 Apr 2021	27 Oct 2021	25 Nov 2021	10.5812/ijp.115502

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, Referee 2 2
2 Revision 1 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

2 comments · 12 Jun 2021 – 17 Oct 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 12 Jun 2021

Dear researcher
Please pay attention to the following points:
1. There are many grammatical and writing issues, some in the subtitle.
2. In the material and method section, you omitted deceased cases. If these cases are not available for lab tests, please state this in the manuscript.
3. CBC findings (such as RBC indices) in patients receiving MTX are a key point. Please compare their relationships with gene mutations (perhaps in a table).

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 17 Oct 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to review the article entitled "Evaluating Methotrexate Toxicity and its Association with ABCB1 Genetic Polymorphism in Children with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia". The aim of this study was to evaluate MTX toxicity and its association with ABCB1 genetic polymorphism in ALL cases. The topic is interesting, but there are some important concerns about this article that should be clarified before the final decision. Moreover, this report has several typographical and grammatical errors. The English is very poor and should be improved by native English speakers.
- Introduction:
1- It is too long (Context).
2- The authors omitted mucosal lesions as a common side effect of MTX.
3- The authors claimed, "According to some research findings, the associated administration of folic acid decreases the incidence of increased serum enzymes" based on references 9 and 14. Reference 9 is a review article, and this claim in that article is not supported by a reference. Reference 14 isn't an interventional or observational study on the side effects of MTX. To date, there is no systematic review or clinical trial that shows the effect of folic or folinic acid on the reduction of MTX hepatotoxicity.
4- The aim of the study should be clearly stated at the end of the introduction.
- Methods: This section is acceptable.
- Results:
4- The excluded case should be mentioned at the beginning of the Results.
5- The study limitations should be explained at the end of the discussion.
* Discussion: ---
* Conclusion:
6- It is inconsistent with the main findings of this study and should be revised thoroughly. Given the nonsignificant findings (with p>0.4 or 0.5), you should not claim "Findings of the current research showed a higher MTX toxicity rate in cases with ABCB1 gene mutation at point 3435 C->T." It is not fair.
* Tables:
7- Based on the main findings, the number of tables should be reduced. For example, tables 4 and 5 could be merged.

* Abstract:
8- The study site should be removed from the aim of the study.

* References:

9- All references should be rearranged based on the journal's instructions.

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.

Dear Reviewer

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and commenting on it.

The manuscript file edited based on the reviewer’s comments.

- The file was edited by native English speakers and the certification added to the files.
- Other CBC findings in patients receiving like RBC was not variable in this study and the same studies those had done before.
- Context became brief.
- About the claiming of, "According to some research findings, the associated administration of folic acid decreases the incidence of increased serum enzymes" based on references 9 and 14. This part was removed based the reviewer comment.
- The aim of the study mentioned at the end of the introduction, clearly.
- In this study fortunately we did not have any excluded cases, it was added to the manuscript.
- The study limitations explained at the end of the discussion.
- The conclusion part was rewritten.
- Tables 4 and 5 merged
- This study was F.Zakaryaei’s medical Thesis and as we asked the Kurdistan university of medical science they said that Farima Zakrayaei as a student should be the first author and Borhan Moradveisi as a First Supervisor should be corresponding author, therefore the author order was changed and the revised title file was added .

Respectfully

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.