

# Review of: "Emphasizing the Vital Role of Robust Peer Review: A Series of Publications Highlighting Potential Errors in Results Reporting and a Plea to Editors"

Paul E. Van Schil<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thoracic and Vascular Surgery, Antwerp University Hospital, Antwerp, Belgium

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper is really an eye-opener. The authors show that critical evaluation of published phase 2 and 3 studies is required, even when published in renowned journals that are often cited. Due to time pressure, many clinicians will only read the abstract or, even worse, only the conclusions, which carries the risk of implementing invalid or unproven diagnostic and therapeutic measures in their patient population. The manuscript shows clear examples, and the discussion clearly highlights the different problems that may occur.

Equally, the reaction of the editors who were informed by the authors of these incorrectly presented results raises concerns, and for some of these papers, no appropriate action was undertaken.

The only comment I have is that the English language can be improved. The manuscript should be corrected by a native English speaker. Examples include:

- page 2, 4th paragraph: "studies that from our analysis these were published"
- page 11, last line: "with the showed in the actual curve"
- page 12, legend for fig. 7: "is much below the showed in the curve"