

Comment on “Prognostic Value of Modified Glasgow Prognostic Score in Acute Decompensated Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction”

Zhi Wang,¹ Leping Shao¹

¹The First Affiliated Hospital of Xiamen University, Fujian Sheng, China

Dear Editor,

We read with interest the article by Tunca et al.,¹ titled “Prognostic Value of Modified Glasgow Prognostic Score (mGPS) in Acute Decompensated Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction.” The study offers valuable insights into the prognostic utility of the mGPS in a selected population of patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction. We would like to respectfully raise two points regarding the statistical methodology that could help readers better interpret the results.

The first point concerns the potential for interval-censored events in the survival data. The authors state that post-discharge outcomes were assessed via “follow-up telephone interviews.” If these interviews did not ascertain the exact date of death, the event time would be known only to fall within the interval between the last known point of contact (e.g., hospital discharge) and the date of the interview. The standard Cox proportional hazards (Cox PH) model has theoretical limitations when applied to interval-censored data, as it is primarily designed for right-censored data in which event times are known precisely. Analyzing such data with a Cox PH model, for instance, by imputing a single event time, can introduce bias into the risk estimates. In contrast, statistical models specifically designed to accommodate interval censoring, such as certain formulations of accelerated failure time (AFT) models, adjust their likelihood function to handle this type of data appropriately.^{2,3} A discussion of how post-discharge event times were handled, and potentially a sensitivity analysis using an AFT model, could provide valuable evidence to support the robustness of the reported hazard ratios.

Furthermore, for a precise understanding of temporal risk dynamics, the proportional hazards assumption underlying the chosen Cox model requires careful scrutiny. It is unclear whether this condition of time-invariant hazard ratios was formally tested, for example, through analysis of Schoenfeld residuals. If this assumption is violated, the reported risk estimates may represent a potentially misleading average over the follow-up period rather than capturing the changing nature of risk. Should non-proportionality be detected, other models—including Cox models with time-dependent effects, stratified Cox models, or accelerated failure time models—would offer a more nuanced characterization of mortality risk.^{4,5}

We believe that clarification of these two methodological aspects would further strengthen the study and aid in the accurate interpretation of its important findings.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.



Cite this article as:

Wang Z, Shao L. Comment on “Prognostic Value of Modified Glasgow Prognostic Score in Acute Decompensated Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction”. *J Clin Pract Res* 2026;48(0):000-000.

Address for correspondence:

Leping Shao,
The First Affiliated Hospital
of Xiamen University, Fujian
Sheng, China

Phone: +86 592 213 7327

E-mail: lepingshao@xmu.edu.cn

Submitted: 27.11.2025

Revised: 17.12.2025

Accepted: 18.12.2025

Available Online: 21.01.2026

Erciyes University Faculty of
Medicine Publications -
Available online at www.jcpres.com



Financial Disclosure: The authors declared that this study received no financial support.

Use of AI for Writing Assistance: AI-assisted technologies were not used in this article.

Author Contributions: Concept – ZW; Resource – LS; Data Collection and/or Processing – ZW; Analysis and/or Interpretation – ZW; Literature Review – LS; Writing – ZW; Critical Review – LS.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

REFERENCES

1. Tunca Ç, Özkan MT, Taş A, İbiş ANÖ, Kivrak A, Tanık VO. Prognostic Value of Modified Glasgow Prognostic Score in Acute Decompensated Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction. *J Clin Pract Res* 2025;47(4):415-23. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
2. Ning J, Qin J, Shen Y. Score Estimating Equations from Embedded Likelihood Functions under Accelerated Failure Time Model. *J Am Stat Assoc* 2014;109(508):1625-35. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
3. Crowther MJ, Royston P, Clements M. A flexible parametric accelerated failure time model and the extension to time-dependent acceleration factors. *Biostatistics* 2023;24(3):811-31. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
4. Blythe R, Parsons R, Barnett AG, Cook D, McPhail SM, White NM. Prioritising deteriorating patients using time-to-event analysis: prediction model development and internal-external validation. *Crit Care* 2024;28(1):247. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
5. Lee KH, Rondeau V, Haneuse S. Accelerated failure time models for semi-competing risks data in the presence of complex censoring. *Biometrics* 2017;73(4):1401-12. [\[CrossRef\]](#)