Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 14 · Issue 2 · e132106

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effectiveness of Overshadowing by Flavored Candies in Management of Chemotherapy-Induced Nausea and Vomiting in Children with Leukemia: A Randomized Trial

Ali Omidi, Manijeh Firoozi, Mehdi Khabazkhoob, Tido von Schoen-Angerer, Nasrin Mehrnoosh, Maryam Rassouli

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
1 Oct 2022	28 Jan 2023	30 Jan 2023	10.5812/compreped-132106

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, Hamed Aghdam, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Hamed Aghdam, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

4 comments · 14 Nov 2022 – 1 Jan 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 14 Nov 2022

comment for authors:
The title was vague. It needs editing. The term “overshadowing” was not clear. It is general and vague. The title must reflect the aim and intervention in the study (flavored candy).
It is suggested that flavored candy be added to the title: “The effectiveness of overshadowing by flavored candy in management of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in children with leukemia”
Introduction:
This section was too long. Sentences unrelated to the aim of the study must be omitted.
The introduction should include a better presentation of the main rationale of the study and emphasize the limitations of previous studies (which I did not see). The authors should focus on overshadowing, especially the effects of flavored candy in this context.
Why did the authors choose flavored candy for overshadowing? What was the hypothesis behind its selection? Please clarify precisely and clearly.
In line 89-90, add flavored candy to the aim of the study: “Thus, the present study sought to examine the effect of overshadowing by flavored candy on controlling . . ..”
Methods:
Many sentences in this section were repetitive. Please merge them.
Date of study?
How much ondansetron was administered?
How much flavored candy did the intervention group receive?
Generic drug names must be used in the title and throughout the whole manuscript as well. The proprietary name should be included in parentheses, along with the name of the manufacturer and the city, upon the first mention in the text.
Results:
The authors said: “However, the changes in the vomiting scores by removing these variables were statistically significant but p value was 0.066!!” It seems that this was not significant if (p=0.066). Please edit the results according to the actual findings and table 2.
Discussion:
In the discussion section, you should first present the main finding(s), especially their novelty, and then refer to other studies.
Conclusion:
This section was not justified and needs complete revision. According to the findings of your study, “There was no significant difference of nausea and vomiting by overshadowing by candy between the two groups” (based on table 2).
thank you

Hamed Aghdam Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 27 Dec 2022

Dear author/s

Based on your valuable article and the relevant checklist, we recommend that you:
1. Identify the study as a randomized trial in the title.

2. Completely define prespecified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed.
3. Specify who generated the allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions.

Some suggestions have also been provided in the attached file.
best regards

Associate Editor MAJOR REVISION 1 Jan 2023

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs revision. Please ask the authors to make corrections.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 1 Jan 2023

Dear Author,
Please reply to all comments and refine the manuscript.

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

Dear Editor

We truly express our appreciation to you and the reviewers of the journal for all your valuable comments. The corrections have been applied completely and explained to the reviewers within the original manuscript, in red font, and submitted as the file *response to reviewers*.

:Reviewer 1

.Identify as a randomized trial in the title .1

The title was corrected.

2. Completely define prespecified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed

Thanks for the comment, outcome measures of the study were defined. The outcome measures of this study are the severity of nausea and the frequency of vomiting 10 minutes before the start of chemotherapy and immediately after its completion that nausea was checked through BARF and the frequency of vomiting was recorded.

3. Who generated the allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions

Generating the allocation, enrolling participants and assigning them to interventions were done by the researcher (first and third author).

Reviewer 2:

Title was vague. It need edit. The term of “overshadowing” was not clear. It is general and vague. Title must be arranged by aim and intervention in study (flavored candy).
It is suggested that flavored candy adding to title: “The effectiveness of overshadowing by flavored candy in management of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in children with leukemia: A randomized trial”.

Thanks for the comment, “flavored candy” was added to title.

It section was too long. Unrelated sentences to the aim of study must be omitted.

Unrelated sentences were deleted to shorten the section.

The introduction should include a better representation of the main rational of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies (I did not see). The authors should be focused on overshadowing especially the effects of candy flavored in this issue.
Why authors choose the flavored candy for overshadowing? What was hypothesis for selection of it? Pl clarify, precise and clear.

Thanks for the suggestion. A few studies have been done on the effect of this technique on chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in cancer patients, and so far no study has investigated the effectiveness of this technique in children with leukemia which can be considered as the most important gap in existed knowledge. The related section has been highlighted in red.

It seems that taste is more related to the stimuli that cause nausea and vomiting and can act stronger and more prominently than other sensory stimuli. Also due to the effectiveness of gustatory stimuli to be associated with an unconditioned stimulus that causes gastric upset, tastes were taken as overshadowing conditioned stimuli and since the implementation of overshadowing in the hospital's daily routine requires ease of use and compliance with high hygienic standards for children in the oncology ward, flavored candies were used in this study.

Geiger F, Wolfgram L. Overshadowing as prevention of anticipatory nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Trials. 2013;14(1):1-9.

Stockhorst U, Wiener JA, Klosterhalfen S, Klosterhalfen W, Aul C, Steingrüber H-J. Effects of overshadowing on conditioned nausea in cancer patients: an experimental study. Physiology & behavior. 1998;64(5):743-53.

In line 89-90, add flavored candy in aim of study: Thus, the present study sought to examine the effect of overshadowing by flavored candy on controlling …….

"Flavored candy" was added to this sentence.

Methods: Many sentences in this section were repetitive. Pl merge those.

Thanks to the reviewer, repetitive sentences were merge and deleted.

Date of study?

This study was done from April 9 to June 27, 2022 which was added to the related section.

How much ondansetron did receive?

Ondansetron with a dose of 0.15 mg/kg was prescribed by the physician and was injected to children.

Burchum JR, Rosenthal LD. Lehne's Pharmacology for Nursing Care E-Book. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2021 Sep 10.

How much flavored candy did receive by intervention group?

Children in the intervention group (overshadowing) were given only one flavored candy according to the study conducted by Geiger and Wolfgram.

Geiger F, Wolfgram L. Overshadowing as prevention of anticipatory nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Trials. 2013; 14(1):1-9.

Generic drug names must be used in the title and throughout the whole manuscript, as well. The proprietary name should be included in parentheses, along with the name of the manufacturer, and city, upon the first mention in the text.

It was revised and proprietary names were included in parentheses.

Results: Authors said: However, the changes in the vomiting scores by removing these variables were statistically significant but p value was 0.066!! It seem that was not significant if (p=0.066). pl edit the results according to real finding and table 2.

Due to the small number of samples, the changes in the vomiting scores was borderline significant.

Chehrei A, Haghdoost AA, Fereshtehnejad SM, Bayat A. Chehrei A, editor. 2nd ed. Statistical methods in medical science researches using SPSS software. Tehran, Iran: Heydari Publications; 2022. P 165-167.

In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first and then allude to other studies.

It was edited and the main finding was written in the first paragraph

Conclusion: This section was not justified and need revision, totally. According to finding of your study, “There was no significant difference of nausea and vomiting by overshadowing by candy between the two groups” (based on table 2).

It was revised and changes in the vomiting showed a borderline significant difference.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 16 Jan 2023 – 21 Jan 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 16 Jan 2023

Comments to the Author:
I reviewed this manuscript again.
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there is room for further improvement, which the authors should consider. The following points are of concern, and minor suggestions are indicated below.
1- The Introduction section was still too long. Sentences unrelated to the aim of the study must be omitted. This section should be presented in 2-3 paragraphs focused on the limitations of previous studies, and sentences unrelated to the aim of the study must be omitted (this is not a lecture note).

2- The authors stated, “Due to the small number of samples, the changes in the vomiting scores was borderline significant”. You can mention this in the limitations section of the study (the last paragraph of the discussion), but in the results, the first part of the discussion, and the conclusion, it should be noted that it was not significant.
In statistical analyses, “borderline significant” is not meaningful. This is not significant. Please correct this throughout the manuscript.

3- The conclusion was not justified. It should be based on the actual findings of the study. According to the findings of your study, “There was no significant difference of nausea and vomiting by overshadowing by candy between the two groups” (based on table 2).
thank you

Hamed Aghdam Reviewer

ACCEPT 21 Jan 2023

Dear Author(s)

Thanks again for your valuable document. I studied the document and enjoyed your precise revision. The document can delight physicians responsible for the management of patients undergoing chemotherapy. So, congratulations.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 21 Jan 2023

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs revision. The author should revise it according to the reviewers' comments.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 21 Jan 2023

Dear Author,
The manuscript still needs revision. Please revise it accurately.

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.

Response to Reviewers

Dear Editor

We truly express our appreciation to you and the reviewers of the journal for all your valuable comments. The corrections have been applied completely and explained to the reviewers within the original manuscript, in red font, and submitted as the file *response to reviewers*.

Reviewer:

Introduction section was too long, yet. Unrelated sentences to the aim of study must be omitted

Unrelated sentences were deleted to shorten the section.

Authors said “Due to the small number of samples, the changes in the vomiting scores was borderline significant”. You can mentioned in limitation section of study (last paragraph of discussion), but in results and first part of discussion and conclusion should be noted that it was not significant. In statistical analyses “borderline significant” was not valuable. This is no significant. pl correct it, in all part of manuscript, totally.

Results and discussion were revised.

Conclusion was not justified. It should be expressed based on the real finding of study. According to finding of your study, “There was no significant difference of nausea and vomiting by overshadowing by candy between the two groups” (based on table 2).

Conclusion was justified based on table 2 and results.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 29 Jan 2023 – 30 Jan 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 29 Jan 2023

Dear authors
I welcome your manuscript.
All comments were addressed by the authors. It is acceptable now.
Thank you

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 30 Jan 2023

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been revised successfully and can be published in one of the next issues.

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 30 Jan 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for revising the manuscript. It is acceptable now.