Nephro-Urology Monthly
Volume 15 · Issue 3 · e139443

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Efficacy of Vitamin E on Renal Function and Preventing Proximal Tubulopathy Caused by Iron Chelation Therapy in Thalassemia Major Patients: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial

Mahdi Moradi Goudarzi, Vahid Falahati, Parsa Yousefichaijan, Amin Tajerian

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Jul 2023	10 Sep 2023	14 Sep 2023	10.5812/numonthly-139443

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 8
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

1 comment · 14 Aug 2023

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 14 Aug 2023

Major Revision

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.

Rebuttal Letter

Nephro-Urology Monthly

139443 - REV 1

26 August 2023

Dear Dr. Behzad Einollahi, Dr. Mohammad Heiat, and Reviewers,

May this letter find you in robust well-being and high spirits.

Our team conveys its profound gratitude to the reviewers for their discerning and productive critique of the manuscript.

We have scrupulously revised and polished the manuscript to integrate their invaluable insights. Specifically, we have thoroughly addressed concerns relating to Abstract formatting, references, and the Figures and Tables issues.

In this document, we provide a comprehensive response to each comment raised by the academic editor and reviewers.

With these extensive revisions, we are confident that the manuscript satisfies the exacting criteria necessary for publication in Nephro-Urology Monthly.

Sincerely,

A.T.,

On behalf of all authors.

Reviewer #1 Comments:

C-1. in result section, line 32, it's hard to follow the report, specifically about the pH, the decrease is not significant according to the p-value (pH after a month (P=0.001 and P=0.19, respectively)).

A-1. The incorrect P-values are now corrected.

C-2. the keywords need to be checked with MeSH terms and reordered alphabetically.

A-2. keywords are now selected from automatic list based on mesh terms:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Acute+Kidney+Injury

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Glomerular+filtration+rate

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/68013789

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Deferasirox

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/68014810

C-3. it could be much better to provide up-to-date statistics about thalassemia

A-3. up-to-date statistics about thalassemia are provided in lines 48-55.

C-4. please use the full form of abbreviations for the first time. i.e. AKI, TM

A-4. AKI and TM abbreviations were described when first mentioned.

C-5. in Trial intervention section, you mentioned that 'individuals with ferritin levels above 1000 receive oral iron chelator Deferasirox...', this could unmask the blindenss of your trial, how do you explain it?

A-5. Our methodology ensures that both the Control and Vitamin E groups are administered Deferasirox under identical conditions, using the same dosage and based on the same criteria (ferritin levels exceeding 1000). Therefore, this uniform approach across both groups ensures that the blinding of the trial remains uncompromised.

C-6. it could be much easier to follow for the readers to provide a table of patients demographic details.

A-6. demographic details are provided in Table 1.

C-7. the consort flow diagram data needs correction, as you provided in the manuscript that each groups had 30 patients, you should change the assessed for eligibility to 60 participants.

A-7. consort flow diagram is updated.

C-8. using the statemnet of 'Among the 50 participants in this study' in most part of the result section would be boring for the readers, consider about replacing them with more interesting substitutions.

A-8. entire Result section’s grammar and typesetting is revised.

C-9. tables should be provided a p-value column for each variable

A-9. p-values are added.

C-10. the data of table 2 needs correction.

A-10. table 2 issues are correced.

C-11. please provide the limitations of your study in discussion.

A-11. limitations section is added at the end of discussion.

C-12. most of your references belongs to a decade ago, please use much up-to-date on (<5 years).

A-12. outdated references were updated.

C-13. figure 3 illustration is hard to follow, please cosider about redesign it

A-13. figure 3 is redesigned

C-14. please provide the original format of CONSORT flow diagram (without any additional design)

A-14. original format of CONSORT flow diagram is provided.

Associate Editor's Comments:

C-1. Major Revision.

A-1. Done

EIC's Comments:

C-1. It requires a major revision.

A-1. Done

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 8 Sep 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 8 Sep 2023

Minor Revision

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.

Dear Reviewer 1,

I would like to express my sincere gratitude for your valuable feedback on my paper. Your comments have been extremely helpful in improving the clarity and precision of the manuscript. I have addressed each of your comments individually as follows:

1. **Caption Improvement for Figures 2 and 3:** I appreciate your suggestion for improving the clarity of the captions for Figures 2 and 3. I have revised both captions to make them more concise and straightforward, providing a clearer description of the figures' content.
2. **Clarification of "M.M.G" in Measurements and Endpoints Section (Line 144):** Thank you for pointing out the need for clarification regarding "M.M.G" in the manuscript. M.M.G. is indeed the author of the paper. I have added a brief explanation when "M.M.G" is first introduced in the text to ensure that readers understand that M.M.G. is the author's name. This clarification should help alleviate any confusion.
3. **Clarification of Minus Sign in Table 3 (HCO3 Decrease in the Vitamin E Group):** I appreciate your comment about the potential ambiguity of the minus sign in the "HCO3 Decrease" column in Table 3. As you correctly pointed out, this negative sign indicates a higher value at Day 30 compared to the baseline, implying an increase rather than a decrease. To clarify this, I have included a note in the table's caption explicitly stating that the "decrease" values were calculated based on the baseline minus Day 30 measurements, where negative values indeed signify an increase.

Thank you once again for your thoughtful and constructive feedback. I believe that these revisions will enhance the overall clarity and comprehension of the manuscript. If you have any further suggestions or comments, please do not hesitate to share them. Your insights are greatly appreciated, and I am committed to ensuring the highest quality of the paper.

Sincerely,

Amin Tajerian

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 14 Sep 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 14 Sep 2023

Accept