Reviewer's report

Title: Residual neurotoxicity in ovarian cancer patients in clinical remission after first-line chemotherapy with carboplatin and paclitaxel. The Multicenter Italian Trial in Ovarian cancer (MITO-4) retrospective study.

Version: 1 Date: 5 October 2005

Reviewer: Gini F Fleming

Reviewer's report:

General
MITO-4 neuropathy

This manuscript addresses an important void in the literature on platinum/taxane-induced peripheral neuropathy, namely how long it lasts.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. It is not clear in the abstract or elsewhere in the manuscript, how it was decided what grade of neuropathy the pt had during treatment. Was this taken from data collected at the time of treatment (e.g. study forms for pts on trial and clinic notes for pts off trial? And is recording that sort of information fairly standardized for off-trial pts at Naples?) or were pts asked to retrospectively state how bad their neuropathy was during treatment?

2. Similarly, was the date of resolution of neuropathy taken by pt history? Or from case-report f/u forms?

3. It should be stated somewhere that this was an human-subjects-committee-approved protocol and subjects gave appropriate consent, or that this was considered exempt by the local human subjects protection committee….

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. There are some wording errors which should be corrected. For example, in the abstract, under "Methods" "patients have been enclosed in this study" would be better said "patients were included in this study", or "registered to this study"
   p 4 "these pts were considered in this study" might be "these pts were eligible for this study"
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Although there was very little high-grade neurotoxicity in this study, it would be of interest to know if initial grade of neuropathy predicted for slower resolution (as would be expected)

**What next?**: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest**: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English**: Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review**: No
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