

Expression of Ki-67 and E-cadherin in patients with non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) attending in a tertiary care hospital

Afroze F et.al

Type of the review: Anonymous Reviewer/Disclosed Author

MECHANICAL EDITING

14 September 2023

Comment

The manuscript has been formatted according to the journal's guidelines. Please confirm that the changes are rightly placed and provide following information.

1. Update the affiliation of all co-authors in the system and sync with ORCID.
2. Complete the "Author contributions" as per journal's guidelines.
3. Provide "Highlights" after the abstract in separate page.
4. Check the newly formatted tables, especially the numbers.

Response

We agreed with that and checked the tables. Provided "Highlights" (page 3), updated author's affiliation (in the system) and contributions (page 13).

TECHNICAL EDITING

21 October 2023

Reviewer's comments

Comment 1

Title: Expression of Ki -67 and E-cadherin in patients with non-small cell lung cancer in a tertiary care hospital.

My opinion (highlighted): Expression of Ki -67 and E-cadherin in patients with non-small cell lung cancer attending in a tertiary care hospital.

Response

We are agreeing with that and revised the title as advised

Comment 2

Corresponding author's name need to be marked with an asterisk (a small star like sign) sign in the author list after superscript number and also before Corresponding author (in superscript) where name of the author need not to mention again.

Response

Revised as advised please find in title page- line 6 and line 23.

Comment 3

In method, under Immunohistochemistry subtopic (in second line) in place of rehydrated in decreasing concentration of isopropyl alcohol, it is wise to mention the percent (% conc.) of Isopropyl alcohol that was exactly used for rehydration.

Response

Percentage of isopropyl alcohol is mentioned (in method, under immunohistochemistry-second line).

Comment 4

In Interpretation of results, calculation with hot spot method is unclear, need to be clarified properly. Again, method of scoring for E-cadherin is not clear. It would be good to provide a standard formula (if any) to calculate a final score of cases.

Response

Interpretation of results subheading is changed to validation of immunohistochemical staining in response to Editor's comment. Hot spot method has been clarified (in 3rd line). Calculation of the final score of E-cadherin has been written in details (line 9-14).

Comment 5

In discussion- High Ki-67 was mentioned in different places, however, in interpretation of result section, no categorization of high and low for Ki-67 was found, only negative and positive qualitative result was mentioned on the basis of a Cut-off Value ($\leq 5\%$ and $>5\%$ respectively). It needs to be addressed clearly in interpretation of results section.

In paragraph 3 (in discussion)- in place of the diagnosis of lung cancer aggressiveness, detection of lung cancer aggressiveness assumed to be appropriate.

Again, within the same paragraph- "These findings are conflicting to this present study" is not appropriate. When we go to compare the findings of a current study with other researcher's similar work, it is wise to write findings of the present study are not consistent to the study of He et al. and Grigoras et al.

Another sentence in the same paragraph- We did not find any statistically significant correlation might be due to small sample size and as percentage of poorly differentiated tumors were less in this study.

My suggestion is to minor modification of the above sentence as below We did not find any statistically significant correlation that might be due to small sample size and less percentage of poorly differentiated tumors analyzed in this study.

In paragraph 5 (last para in discussion)- Last sentence can be a little bit modified as Ki -67 expression may be considered as a valuable marker for aggressive NSCLC and for prognosis of lung cancer as suggested by few studies (cite references). However, we need an extended study to explore the issue. Duplication of the sentence should be avoided.

Response

Revised as advised. $\leq 5\%$ is considered as negative or low and $> 5\%$ as positive or high expression of Ki-67 (in method under validation of immunohistochemical staining line 9, in result under Ki-67 and E-cadherin expression in NSCLC patients first line).

In paragraph 3 (in discussion)- revised as requested (third line).

In paragraph 3 (in discussion)- revised as requested (last line).

Last paragraph in discussion is also been modified according to reviewer's comment.

Comment 6

Limitation: No comments

Conclusion: Selection of small sample size is a limitation of the study, need not to mention repeatedly in conclusion. Other parts are alright.

Response

First sentence of conclusion is modified according to reviewer's comment.

Comment 7

Acknowledgements: Dr Farida Arjuman herself is an author of the manuscript, need not to keep her name in the acknowledgement. Only the persons who supported the study, not possible to include as authors may be acknowledged.

Response

Revised as advised (first sentence from acknowledgement is omitted).

Comment 8

Regarding tables: Table 1 and Table 2- No observations.

Regarding Fig 3 and Fig 4: Size of the number squares within the bar need to increase for better visualization. Size of numbers in Y-axis also may be increased

Response

According to editor's comment, Fig 3 and Fig 4 has been removed from the manuscript.

Executive Editor's comments

Comment 1

Abstract's Methods indicate the use of correlation. However, no correlation has been reported in the manuscript. Kindly change this. Please avoid it for the whole manuscript.

Response

Revised as advised. (In abstract under method subtopic).

Comment 2

Main text: The Objective should be part of the Introduction. No separate heading is needed for the Objective.

Response

Separate heading of objective has been omitted. Objective is included in introduction (last sentence in introduction).

Comment 3

Avoid very small paragraphs like the "Study design".

Response

Revised as advised. This paragraph has been included in method under Sample size and sampling technique subtopic (first line).

Comment 4

Interpretation of results heading in the Methods section is probably to indicate " Validation of the histopathology slides". Interpretation is done in the Discussion section

Response

Interpretation of results heading is changed as Validation of immunohistochemical staining.

Comment 5

Results: The second heading should be "Agreement between the expression of Ki-67 and E-cadherin"

Response

Revised as advised.

Comment 6

Results presented in Figures 3 and 4 are already presented in Table 2. Kindly avoid these figures.

Response

Figure 3 and 4 are deleted from the manuscript.

Comment 7

No superscripts are needed after the authors' name initials.

Response

Revised as advised (in Authors contribution)

Comment 8

References: Avoid et al and list all authors. Add DOIs to all journal articles. Provide access dates for the URLs.

Response

Revised as requested. All authors are listed. We have included DOIs to journal articles. Some journal articles' (5,7,10,18) DOIs were not found. In those cases, PMID or URLs have been added. Access date has been included for the URL.

COPY EDITING

17 November 2023

The journal office team, under the guidance of the Executive Editor, has diligently worked on revising your manuscript. We have made substantial language changes to enhance the clarity and overall quality of the content. Please find attached the revised version of the manuscript. We kindly request you to thoroughly review the changes made and confirm your agreement with them. Additionally, we have highlighted specific areas in the manuscript that require your attention, marked in yellow. Please provide the necessary information in these sections. The key changes made are as follows:

Comment 1

Merged Table 1 and 2. Removed education, occupation, and smoking variables due to their lack of significance and insufficient literature support. If you wish you may include this information in text under the results section, however you must address those in the discussion with appropriate references. Note that the information from the previous Table 1 has been incorporated into the new table (last line). Also revised the abstract according to the changes in the table. Please ensure that the message is conveyed clearly.

Response

Agreed with the changes made in the Table. Correction was done where needed.

Comment 2

Journal office done language editing in the methods section to make understandable and aligned with the workflow. Please provide the information marked in yellow in the attached revised version

Response

Thanks for the revision and agree with that. Necessary information has been provided in the marked portion.

Comment 3

Have completed the language editing in the results section of the main text according to the updated table. Kindly review to ensure no information has been overlooked or that all points have been accurately addressed.

Response

Thank you for the language editing in the results section. We have thoroughly reviewed the changes, and it appears that all information has been accurately addressed. We are satisfied with the revisions made to enhance the quality of the manuscript.

Comment 3

Tune the discussion section, and organize it based on major findings, make it little shorter. Include a statement on the front page (below) indicating whether this work is part of a thesis work. Overall reduce the main text within 1500 words.

Response

Corrections have been made accordingly. We could reduce the main text within 1824 words. The discussion section has been refined and shortened based on major findings, ensuring conciseness.

We have included a statement on the front page indicating that “**This work encompasses the MS thesis of Dr Farzana Afroze**”.