Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Volume 15 · Issue 1 · e158219

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Autologous Platelet Rich Fibrin Versus Steroid in Ultrasound-Guided Sacroiliac Joint Injection for Joint Dysfunction: Randomized Comparative Study

Omar Sayed Fargaly, Mohamed Ahmed Hamed, Maged Labib Boules, Mohammed Awad Alsaied, Mohammed Magdy Basiony, Mohammad Omar Mostafa, Amr Hamdy Mahmoud, Mohamed Ahmed Shawky

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
9 Dec 2024	15 Jan 2025	25 Jan 2025	10.5812/aapm-158219

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Laleh Hakemibarabadi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Laleh Hakemibarabadi, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

5 comments · 15 Dec 2024 – 23 Dec 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 Dec 2024

Dear Associate Editor
I thank the authors and express my appreciation to the researchers.
This study contributes valuable insights into the comparative efficacy of PRF and steroid injections for SIJ dysfunction.
Here I have some suggestions and comments that should be addressed:
-Address potential confounding factors for complications, particularly the increased pain and stiffness observed with PRF.

-The discussion lacks a thorough exploration of the potential mechanisms by which PRF may provide prolonged pain relief compared to steroids.

-While some references are recent, it would strengthen the manuscript to include more recent studies (after 2020) or systematic reviews to reinforce the findings and claims made in the discussion.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 16 Dec 2024

Hi, thanks for your invite. My opinions are as follows:
1. In the abstract, the methods section is too weak.
2. The abstract is too weak, especially the methods and results sections.
3. Please add an image of the ultrasound-guided procedure (patient position, transducer position and orientation, needle position, etc.).
Best wishes

Laleh Hakemibarabadi Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 17 Dec 2024

1- Thanks to the authors for the valuable study.
2- Although the manuscript is well-organized, it needs grammatical editing.
3- line 13- You have to mention important numerical findings.
4- Did you perform the diagnostic injection test (line 77) in the same session as the procedure or before enrollment?
5- Did you take 2 blood samples, 1 for laboratory and coagulation results before the procedure and 1 for PRF and placebo in the two groups?
6- line 131- You prescribed baclofen for cardiac monitoring!!
7- lines 13 and 174- You have reported VAS at month 1, but in line 134, you did not assess VAS at month 1.
8- line 138- Why did you mention demographic information under the topic of secondary outcomes?
9- Redesign the tables with better boxing and gridding.
10- table 3- You have to provide the full phrase before the acronym first appears. You mentioned it at line 212!
11- table 4- You have to explain the timing and the way you recorded complications in the methods section.
12- line 196- Is there more than one hospital involved in the study?
13- line 196- You did not perform the study "in order to obtain a longer duration of pain relief" but to study the dependent variables.

14- line 210- You cannot say "alters the disease process with the purpose of increasing the joint healing rate". You can only report what you measured and nothing more.
15- line 226 to 231- This study's findings do not corroborate your findings.
16- lines 232 to 241- They examined two other groups, PRP and PRF, and you cannot compare their results to your findings.
17- Lines 246 to 252- These duplicate the results section.
18- line 265- You did not find a significant difference in ODI. How did you conclude that there was lower functional impairment in the P group?

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 23 Dec 2024

Dear EIC,
I thank the authors and express my appreciation to the researchers. The manuscript presents valuable research. But some revisions are needed. The authors should revise it based on the comments. Also, a minor change should be made to the abstract:
The Results section is too poor. Also, a summary of the statistical analysis results should be mentioned in the Results section.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 23 Dec 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the article. It needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response letter to the Editor-in-Chief

Dear Sir,

Thanks for your great effort, valuable comments, advice, and the opportunity to revise and resubmit the manuscript.

Question number	The problem	The replay
Editor comments		
Reviewer 1		
	Address potential confounding factors for complications, particularly the increased pain and stiffness observed with PRF	Stated in line 252, 253 and 254.
	The discussion lacks a thorough exploration of the potential mechanisms by which PRF may provide prolonged pain relief compared to steroids.	Stated in line 214 and 215.
	While some references are recent, it would strengthen the manuscript to include more recent studies(after 2020) or systematic reviews to reinforce the findings and claims made in the discussion	Limited research have been done on injectable platelet rich fibrin in joint dysfunction pain.
Reviewer 2		
	In abstract part, methods part is too weak	Done

	Abstract part is too weak, especially in methods and results part.	done
	Please add image of ultrasound guided procedure (patient position, transducer position and orientation, needle position and ...).	Figure added line 158:161
Reviewer 3		
	line 13 you have to mention important numerical findings.	done .
	Did you perform diagnostic injection test (line 77) in the same session of procedure or before enrollment?	In the same session.
	Did you take 2 blood samples 1 for laboratory and coagulation results before the procedure and 1 for PRF and placebo in two groups?	Yes 2 blood samples.
	line 131- you prescribed baclofen for cardiac monitoring	The stay in PACU for 2 hours for monitoring. Correction done.
	lines 13 and 174- you have reported VAS in month 1, line 134 you did not assess VAS in month 1.	Pain at one month by VAS is the primary outcome of the study as stated in its' protocol registered at Clinicaltrial.gov Correrection done.
	line 138- Why did you mentioned demographic information under the topic of secondary	For proper matching between study groups. And for further future studies for prevalence.

	outcomes?	
	Re-design tables by better boxing and gridding.	Done.
	table 3- You have to bring full phrase before first appearing acronym. You mentioned it at line 212!	Done.
	table 4- You have to explain timing and the way you recorded complications in the methods section.	Done in line 185, 187 ,190 and 191.
	line 196- Are there more than one hospital engaged in the study?	No single hospital (Fayoum university Hospital).
	line 196- You did not perform the study "in order to obtain a longer duration of pain relief" but to study the dependent variables.	Done.
	line 210- You can not say "alters the disease process with the purpose of increasing the joint healing rate". You can just report what you measured and nothing more.	Done.
	line 226 to 231- This study findings are not corroborated to your findings.	Correction done.
	lines 232 to 241- They examined two another groups PRP and PRF	We compared the PRF group results with our results.

	and you can not compare results to your findings	
	Lines 246 to 252- Are duplication of the results section.	We have removed it.
	line 265- You did not reached significant difference in ODI. How did you conclude lower functional impairment in P group?	Correction done.

2 Revision 1

5 comments · 15 Jan 2025 – 25 Jan 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 15 Jan 2025

Dear AE,
I reviewed the manuscript again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated.
The authors have addressed all comments.
Thank you

Laleh Hakemibarabadi Reviewer — ACCEPT 18 Jan 2025

Thanks for the corrections.

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT 25 Jan 2025

Hi, thanks for your invite. I read the reviewers' comments. All of them were addressed. I'd prefer to accept it.
Best wishes

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 25 Jan 2025

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the manuscript again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated.
The authors have addressed all comments.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 25 Jan 2025

Dear authors.
Thanks for your valuable efforts in carefully revising the manuscript.