

Change of lipid profile in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia due to induction chemotherapy in a tertiary care hospital of Bangladesh

Siddique R et al. (rspdccc@yahoo.com)

Editor's comments (26-Feb-23)		Author's response (28-Mar-23) <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.	This manuscript needs a MAJOR revision. Please follow the Admin Checklist attached. All points must be addressed.	1.	All points in the admin checklist have been addressed according in the manuscript.
2.	Objective is not clear. Please add an objective to the Introduction that would be testable.	2.	The objective has been revised accordingly (Page 3 Line 76), and Page 6, Line 152.
3.	How come children aged 3-15 consent to participate? What is the justification for using this age group for the study?	3.	The consent and assent have been taken from the parents and children and mentioned Page-3 Lines 82-83 (Abstract) and Page 6, Lines 162-164.
4.	There are so many orphan lines! Please merge them into relevant texts above or below for a meaningful thematic paragraph.	4.	The points are noted and corrected.
5.	Statistical analysis has nothing but $P < 0.05$. Kindly mention what tests were used and why.	5.	The statistical analysis section has been revised and mentioned the statistical test. Also mentioned in Table 3 Page 13 Line 368.
6.	Figure 1 is redundant to Table 1. Drop it.	6.	Dropped Figure 1 as advised.
7.	Table 2 is also not necessary. Mean and SD are sufficient to describe the lipid levels.	7.	Dropped Table 2 as advised.
8.	The table below the footnote of Table 3 is meaningless. A post-hoc test (e.g., Tukey) could be used to indicate this in the footnote of Table 3.	8.	Corrected accordingly.
9.	In the Conclusion, the question remained unanswered. Please revise it. What is the problem if the lipid levels are decreased or increased transiently? Do the clinicians need to treat those or what? Reflect those.	9.	Points were noted and corrected Page 10, Line 261.
10.	Please the Discussion section centering around the authors' main message. It is lengthy without any valid reasons.	10.	Noted and corrected.
11.	Please format the manuscript as a Brief Article (see the criteria in the Admin Checklist).	11.	Agreed and formatted accordingly.
Editor's Decision	a. Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	b. Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	c. Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Reviewer's comments		Author's response	
Date review assigned	01-Jan-22	Date sent to author	26-Feb-23
Date review returned	24-Jan-23	Date received from author	28-Mar-23
Reviewer name, affiliation, email, ORCID	Prof. Syed Md Akram Hussain Square Hospitals Ltd. syedmdakram@gmail.com 0000-0001-8177-3248		
Conflict of interest of the reviewer	None		

Please write Yes or No		Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is No. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.
1. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	No	The objective of this study has been revised in a measurable terms in page 2 (abstract) and page 4 (introduction)
2. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	No	Abstract has been revised according to the journal's guideline (Page 2).
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?	Yes	-
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?	No	The statistical analysis section has been added in details.
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	Tables and Figures have been revised and given at the end of the manuscript.
10. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	-
11. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	No	Strengths and limitations are discussed under the Discussion section.
12. Are the conclusions justified by the results	Yes	-
13. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	-
14. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-
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.
1. Need to enrich the "Abstract" by brief and precise discussion of results.		1. Revised the abstract as advised (Page 2).
2. Need to add more population information of Bangladesh in "Introduction".		2. Add information in Introduction section (Page 4).
Reviewer's Recommendation (Tick mark on the open boxes to the right)	a. Minor revision	✓
	b. Major revision	
	c. Reject	

Second round

Executive Editor's comments (05-Apr-23)	Author's response (06-Apr-23)
<p>We have identified the following issues to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The results section of the manuscript given with the Tables. Please write the result section in the main text and keep tables and figures at the end of the manuscript. You mentioned two appendices in the manuscript. However, we did not find any attachments. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results section has been added in the main text and tables and figures have been provided at the end of the manuscript. Second point was wrongly added however now corrected.