Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Volume 9 · Issue 2 · e100986

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Quality Analysis of Antimicrobial Restriction Policy in Pediatrics

Andre Ricardo Araujo da Silva, Deborah Cardoso Albernaz de Almeida Dias

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Jan 2020	18 Oct 2020	26 Nov 2020	10.5812/pedinfect.100986

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, Shahnaz Armin, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Referee 3, Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 7

3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 8

Authors' reply to reviewers 9

Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

5 comments · 21 Apr 2020 – 27 Jun 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 21 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The method used in this study is a chart review, not a cohort
Regards

Shahnaz Armin Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 2 May 2020

Dear AE,
it is an interesting article and the subject is very important.
I have 2 questions: if authors want to show the role of antimicrobial restriction in appropriate antibiotic usage, they should compare the rate of that antibiotic before and after antibiotic restriction policy .although the rate of appropriate requisition was excellent in this study but it has 2 bias :
1- Maybe the clinicians are well educated in this center and before restriction also use appropriate antibiotics
2- Authors didn't mention the forms were evaluated with one sub-specialist or 2 people separately reviewing them and their opinion was compatible.
Thanks

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 13 May 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Thank you for your exciting study on a subject that concerns many clinicians around the world.
- The rate of positive blood cultures are unusually high is your study, although you should have mentioned that where is the site of sample collection. If it is assumed blood culture, the rate of a positive culture is around 10% based on various studies. - Please explain the reason for this finding and mention the type of learning in your manuscript.
- In the first line of the 5th paragraph of the discussion, you mentioned "extended-spectrum producers," to which I assume you meant "Extended-Spectrum Beta-lactamase Producers." After that, you used abbreviation ESBL without mentioning the phrase abbreviated.
- This is an observational study that reported excellent utilization of select antimicrobial agents; the substance for publication is somehow limited in the manuscript. I suggest that you either go in-depth about your methods for achieving these results and possibly compare the data before and after the intervention.
Thanks

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 24 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author.

According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 27 Jun 2020

Dear author,
Thank you so much for your contribution to APID.
According to the reviewers' comments, my decision about this manuscript is a major revision.
Thanks.

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.

Reply to Reviewers Letter

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear author
The method used in this study is a chart review not a cohort
Regards

Thank you for your suggestion. We modified the type of study for an observational study. Please see the methods section, study design sub section, first paragraph.

Reviewer 2:
Thank you for your exciting study on a subject that concerns many clinicians around the world.
The rate of positive blood cultures are unusually high is your study, although you should have mentioned that where is the site of sample collection. If it is assumed blood culture, the rate of a positive culture is around 10% based on various studies. Please explain the reason for this finding and mention the type of learning in your manuscript. **Thank you for your suggestions. We improved this aspect in the discussion section to better explain this result. Please see the sixth paragraph of discussion**

In the first line of the 5th paragraph of discussion, you mentioned "extended-spectrum producers," to which I assume you meant "Extended-Spectrum Beta-lactamase Producers." After that, you used abbreviation ESBL without mentioning the phrase abbreviated. **We corrected the expression for Extended-Spectrum Beta-lactamase producers.**

This is an observational study that reported excellent utilization of select antimicrobial agents; the substance for publication is somehow limited in the manuscript. I suggest that you either go in-depth about your methods for achieving these results and possibly compare the data before and after the intervention. **Unfortunately formal data of appropriateness of antimicrobial prescription before intervention were not available because it was a new routine in the institution. Considering this, we report this fact as a limitation of our article.**

Reviewer 3:
it is interesting article and the subject is very important .
i have 2 question :if authors want to show the role of antimicrobial restriction in appropriate antibiotic usage ,they should compare the rate of those antibiotic before and after antibiotic restriction policy .
Unfortunately formal data of appropriateness of antimicrobial prescription before intervention were not available because it was a new routine in the institution. Considering this, we report this fact as a limitation of our article.

although the rate of appropriate requisition was excellent in this study but it has 2 bias :
1- may be the clinicians are well educated in this center and before restriction also they use appropriate antibiotics **Thank you for your contribution. Could be a reasonable explanation and we reported this in the eight paragraph of discussion.**

2- authors didn't mention the forms evaluated with one sub specialist or 2 person separately reviewed them and their opinion were compatible .
We clarified this aspect. The analysis of requisitions was conducted by the senior pediatric infectious disease specialist and not for 2 different persons. Please see Methods section, antimicrobial stewardship program.

2 Revision 1

5 comments · 10 Aug 2020 – 3 Sep 2020

Associate Editor

REJECT 10 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
We should inform the authors we cannot publish this study without a comparison of before and after data. the descriptive data without comparison and discussing the variables alone cannot help other clinicians to archive similar results. I strongly advise doing a comparative study with a complete analysis of variables.
Thanks.

Referee 3 Reviewer

REJECT 22 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This title is so interesting but for showing the effect of antibiotic stewardship authors should design comparison methods (before and after intervention) so with this data as other reviewers mentioned before we couldn't show the effect of the intervention. it can be published as a letter.
Thank you

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 25 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 3 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
This article is not very valuable in terms of research, and accepting it depends on the value of the content presented in it, which is up to you to decide.
The fact that I have registered my opinion as a minor revision is due to the fact that I have judged it only from the aspect of reporting and working method.
Regards

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 3 Sep 2020

Dear author,
Please revise it according to reviewers' comments, as much as possible.
Then we can accept it as a brief report.
Thanks.

3

Revision 2

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.

Reply to Reviewers Letter

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
-

Reviewer 2:
this title is so interesting but for showing the effect of antibiotic stewardship authors should designed comparison method (before and after intervention) so with this data as other reviewer mentioned before we couldn't show effect of intervention .it can publish as letter.
thank you

Thank you for your comments. As we described in the methodology section, our study is not a before x after intervention but a retrospective study. Our intention was to analyze the quality of target antimicrobial requisitions after an antimicrobial policy restriction for children. In the discussion section, we discussed why rates of appropriateness were higher, compared with other studies (please see eighth paragraph of discussion) . It's important to note that our limitations are also discussed (ninth paragraph) and includes the reason why a study before x after was not conducted.

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 28 Oct 2020 – 26 Nov 2020

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 28 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
Due to the study's content and the fact that the authors cannot add the before data, we consulted our epidemiologist. He approved the methodology as is, so we accept the manuscript in the current format.
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 26 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.