

Vincristine induced peripheral neuropathy in children undergoing chemotherapy for acute lymphoblastic leukaemia during induction.

Sultana N et al. (dr.nazneensultana11@gmail.com)

Executive Editor's comments (20-Sept-22)		Author's response (31-Dec-22)						
		<i>Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.</i>						
1.	Please follow the Admin checklist attached for revising your manuscript. All points must be addressed.	1. Admin checklist followed.						
2.	Use 6 tables at max. Tables 1-3 could be given in one Table.	2. Tables 1 and 2 are merged together and maximum 6 Tables are used.						
3.	Flowchart needs refinement.	3. Excluded cases are mentioned in Figure 1.						
4.	Elaborate limitations. If it is only the sample size, then link it to the number required and the number you have.	4. Page 9, line 233 elaboration added.						
5.	Recommendation should be part of the Conclusion, in brief.	5. Page 9, Lines 235-241 recommendation added to Conclusion.						
Editor's Decision	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>a. Minor revision</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Major revision</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Reject</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	a. Minor revision		b. Major revision	✓	c. Reject		
a. Minor revision								
b. Major revision	✓							
c. Reject								

Reviewer's comments		Author's response	
Date review assigned	28-Aug-22	Date sent to author	20-Sept-22
Date review returned	03-Sept-22	Date received from author	31-Dec-22
Reviewer name, affiliation, email, ORCID	Dr. Nazmul Hasan nazmul_31st@yahoo.com 0000-0002-5737-5124		
Conflict of interest of the reviewer	None		
Please write Yes or No		<i>Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is No. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.</i>	
1.	Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes	
2.	Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	No	Page 3, Abstract corrected as per instruction, Lines 42-63.
3.	Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	Yes	
4.	Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	No	Pages 5-6, Methodology described, lines 105-150.
5.	Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	Yes	
6.	Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	
7.	Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	Yes	
8.	Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	Yes	
9.	Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	No	Pages 14-18, Tables are rearranged as per instruction.
10.	Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	
11.	Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	Yes	
12.	Are the conclusions justified by the results	No	Page 9, lines 235-241, Conclusion changed as per instruction.
13.	Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	No	Pages 10-13, all references are updated and changed to the Vancouver style.

14. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	No	Grammar checked and texts revised.
15. Descriptive comments to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
Major points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Title: In this study probably your team tried to find out the percentage of VIPN in ALL patients. So, I would suggest to change the title so that it matches the results and objectives. (percentage/ prevalence of VIPN in ALL during induction period). Abstract: Reduce the word count in background section and add aim of the study. Study design is improperly written as per your study it should be an interventional study rather observational study. If the result of your study is significant it should be clearly mentioned in the result. The conclusion is not clear as well. Methodology: The study design needs to be adequately described. In the case of minors, consent should be replaced by assent. Figure-1: Legend should be a flowchart of how the study has been done. Drop-out and excluded cases should be mentioned in the flowchart. Figure 2 can be omitted. Tables: Organize the table serially and describe properly inside the text portion of the results with proper referencing of the table number. Tables 1-3 should be merged into a single table as Table 1. Tables 6 and 7 are not required as it is a duplication. One OR needs to be calculated for the exposed compared to the unexposed group of VIPN for the results described in Table 9. References: Needs to be changed as per the Vancouver style of referencing system. There are several grammatical errors and 43% plagiarism. Minor points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reorganize your manuscript as per author guidelines of BSMMU Journal. Ethical clearance number and date should be mentioned. 		Major points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> As prevalence is a measure of the frequency of a disease or health condition in a population at a particular point in time and we observed the frequency of VIPN in this study, so frequency could be kept in the title. Page 3, Abstract changed as per instruction. Pages 5-6, line 105-150, Methodology described. Page 14, figure 1 excluded cases are mentioned. Pages 14-18, tables are rearranged as per instruction. Pages 10-13, all references are updated and changed to the Vancouver style. Grammar checked and plagiarised texts removed. Minor points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reorganization done as per author guidelines of BSMMU Journal. Page 10, Lines 255-258, Institutional Review Board of BSMMU. Memo No. BSMMU/2017/13323 Date: 13-11-2017.
16. Reviewer's Recommendation (Tick mark on the open boxes to the right)	d. Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> e. Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> f. Reject <input type="checkbox"/>	

Second round

Executive editor's comments (31-Dec-22)	Author's response (14-Feb-23)
The Admin Checklist is incomplete. Still have several formatting issues.	Respected sir, sorry for my late response. I tried my best to follow the journal's instructions and revised the manuscript.

Third round

Executive editor's comments (1-Mar-23)	Author's response (10-Mar-23)
<p>Thank you so much for sending the revised version of the manuscript. However, the following points are still need to be addressed as per journal checklist.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please mention the type of the manuscript in the checklist.2. The abstract must be separated into Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion.3. As per journal rules table and figure should not exceed 6.	<p>Following corrections were done</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Type of manuscript mentioned in the revised checklist.2. Abstract was corrected as mentioned.3. Tables and Figures are kept 6 in number.