

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"

Neil Burnet¹

¹ Independent researcher

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a really useful paper, for 3 main reasons. Firstly, it contains a very helpful description of the hazard ratio (HR) and relative risk, and it reminds us how to use these. Secondly, it discusses 5 trials whose results appear to be statistically significant, and which might lead to clinical adoption of new treatments, but in which the absolute differences are small and perhaps not significant. The reader can therefore make a clearer assessment of those trial results and the clinical value of the new treatments tested. Finally, it should serve as a reminder to us all to look more closely and carefully at trial results.

My only question is for an explanation of the 'change' in statistical significance when moving from conventional logrank p values to HR p values. It would be helpful to have such an explanation for myself and to show to others.