

Peer Review

Review of: "Sotorasib Treatment Could Worsen the Prognosis of Advanced KRASG12C-Mutated Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer"

Hany Akeel Al-hussaniy¹

1. University of Baghdad, Iraq

This commentary presents a thought-provoking and statistically oriented critique of the CodeBreak 200 trial evaluating sotorasib in KRASG12C-mutated NSCLC, and its major strength lies in highlighting the potential discrepancy between hazard ratio (HR) interpretation and absolute risk measures, as well as raising legitimate concerns regarding informative censoring and survival analysis transparency. The manuscript demonstrates strong clinical relevance and provides detailed recalculations using alternative censoring assumptions, which stimulate critical discussion about how oncology trial outcomes are communicated to clinicians. However, the article would benefit from several refinements to improve scientific balance and methodological rigor. The argument occasionally relies on speculative assumptions when reclassifying censored patients as events, which should be clearly framed as sensitivity hypotheses rather than alternative outcome estimates, and ideally supported by formal statistical modeling or competing-risk analyses. The commentary would also be strengthened by a more balanced discussion of established regulatory and statistical standards supporting HR-based survival endpoints, as well as inclusion of additional clinical outcomes such as response rates, quality of life, toxicity profiles, and subgroup analyses to avoid overinterpretation of selected metrics. Furthermore, the tone occasionally shifts toward strong causal or regulatory criticism, which could be moderated by emphasizing uncertainty and acknowledging the need for confirmatory trials. Structurally, clearer explanation of statistical concepts for a broader clinical readership, reduction of repetitive sections, and inclusion of a concise limitations paragraph would enhance clarity and academic credibility. Overall, the article raises important methodological concerns but would gain greater impact, objectivity, and

acceptance through more cautious interpretation, expanded statistical validation, and improved balance between critique and contextual evidence.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.