

Review of: "On the Need for Better Information from Randomized Clinical Trials in Oncology"

Stefaan W. Van Gool

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I read with great interest the manuscript of Bornstein and Duenas-Gonzalez on the need for better information from randomized clinical trials in oncology, because I also feel the same need in my practice. This topic is of high interest to me, and I hope that commentaries like this receive a high impact in the future.

The authors commented on the last 5 RCTs published in the NEJM, which is, of course, a top-tier medical journal.

The development of the topic is, to my interpretation, not satisfactory. Different terms are mentioned: Hazard Ratio, Relative Risk, Absolute Risk, Number needed to harm, Number needed to treat. The paper would increase in weight if the calculation of the different terms were briefly explained. In particular, the Absolute Risk calculation methodology in such comparative PFS and OS analyses is not at all clear to me. On top of that, the OS RRR% and OS ARr%, presented in the table, do not mention the time point taken for the calculation (is it the median?), which according to their own commentary, is needed.

Of note, in the table, change OS NTT to OS NT.

Of note, the first link for the Relative Risk Online Calculator does not bring the reader further.

Overall, the manuscript is not acceptable for publication in its current form. However, major revisions might improve the manuscript so that the important discussion can become available for the readership.