OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/pedinfect.111168
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: In Press(In Press); e111168

Peer Review Report for "Study of Obtaining Informed Consent in Pediatric Wards from the Viewpoint of Physicians and Children's Parents"

Author(s): Soodabeh Rezvani, Mohsen Fadavi, Shabnam Bazmi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 10 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 6 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Comments for the authors:
1- The objectives of the study are not clearly stated. The descriptive and analytical objectives of the study should be clearly written.
2- There are spelling mistakes in the text.
3- Why is there no analytical comparison between the questionnaire of doctors and parents?
4- The discussion is very sparse and does not follow a specific axis, please rewrite the discussion with a focus on goals after reviewing and clarifying the goals.
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 29 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- The objectives of the study are not clearly stated. Descriptive and analytical objectives of the study should be clearly written.
- There are spelling and grammar mistakes in the text.
- Why is there no analytical comparison between the questionnaire of doctors and parents?

- The discussion is very sparse and does not follow a specific axis, please rewrite the discussion with a focus on goals after reviewing and clarifying the goals.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 12 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
This is a good study, however, needs major revision:
1. Abstract:
Results: In the main body of the paper, some very interesting information has been written about the practice of obtaining informed consents, (for e.g. lines 47 to line 50, lines 56, 57….) I recommend that this information should be included in the abstract in a concise form.
2. Introduction….. Discussion: The introduction is too long, please make it brief and only give details about the topic in question; please do not explain the national legal system about parental rights and consent, it is not relevant to the title, methodology, results or conclusion. One can put the relevant details in one or two short paragraphs.
Main objective of the study should be clearly stated at the end of the introduction, the title of the paper, methodology, results, discussion and the conclusion should be consistent with the main objective or aim of the paper. Authors should focus on these issues: why was the study done? to find out what? (Objective), how was it conducted, (Methods), what were the findings? (Results), interpretation of findings, and comparison with other studies, together with the limitations and the strength of the study, (Discussion), and, finally the Conclusion. Conclusion should be based only on the findings of the present study, not on the findings of other researchers. If applicable Recommendations may be given on the basis of the conclusion. Please follow this format, so that different parts of the paper are consistent with each other and all parts follow the main objective.
3. Conclusion: Only the first sentence in the section on conclusion describes the conclusions reached from this study, this part may be expanded. The next paragraphs mainly deal with recommendations and may be given a separate heading.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 14 Dec 2020

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

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to reviewers:

Thanks for your special attention and useful comments.

Comments of reviewer 1:

1- The objectives of the study corrected and stated at the end of discussion.
2- Spelling mistakes in the text corrected as well under observation of a translator.
3- Why is there no analytical comparison between the questionnaire of doctors and parents? Our purpose was not comparing the opinion of physicians and parents and the questions are not quietly the same. But in discussion we have compared the answers of these two groups in similar questions.
4- The discussion rewritten and corrected as possible.

Comments of reviewer 2:

1. Abstract: we added some results to abstract but because of word limitation, other results are presented in main text in expanded form..
2.We made the introduction as brief as possible, Main objective of the study clearly stated at the end of the introduction

3. Conclusion expanded and separated from recommendations as reviewers suggested.

All changed parts highlighted yellow all over the main text.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 16 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
In descriptive studies, the condition of an organization or community is described, and finally either its strengths and weaknesses are identified, or the burden of a disease is estimated.
In exploratory studies, possible factors influencing an event or outcome are discovered and the result is a hypothesis.
In explanatory (analytical) studies, the relationship between two or more variables is examined, the result of which is to prove the relationship between factors and events or consequences.
Your study does not have any of these characteristics, and it is not clear what the purpose of conducting the study is, and since the purpose is unclear, the main direction of the discussion is also unclear.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors have made some alterations to the paper, as recommended by the reviewers, however, some minor modifications will help to improve the quality of this paper.
Abstract:
- Results: Total number of respondents should be mentioned with other essential details, like the type of consent, (written or oral, with their percentages). This part should be very specific and only give the figures, (only the result as given in the tables), not what the results 'show'. The last sentence "The results of the study showed that there is no significant association between how informed consent is obtained and the child's age, the number of hospitalizations, and the relation of the person giving informed consent to the children respectively", is actually an interpretation of the results, should be deleted, and, if necessary, included in the discussion or conclusion. The second last sentence "The parents and physicians' answers are similar in some parts but are different in some items like involving parents in making a final decision", is extremely vague, if you want to include it you will have to give the exact numbers and details about the "parts and items" that were "similar and or different"
- Conclusion: In this section, the authors must write what the 'results show'. The present conclusion that has been written is largely encompassed recommendations based on the

conclusion!

In the main body of the paper the authors have written a more valid conclusion, i.e. “The results also showed that there is a gap between the parents and physicians’ opinion about the informed consent, as the physicians believe that they act as the patients’ parents wish and the parents believe that their opinion plays no important role in the final decision regarding the health of their children”. This can be rephrased and written as the conclusion in the abstract.

Thank you

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 26 Jan 2021

Dear author,

Thank you so much for your contribution to APID.

According to reviewers' comments, my decision about this manuscript is a major revision.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to reviewers:

Thanks for your special attention and useful comments.

Reviewer 1:

Dear author
In descriptive studies, the condition of an organization or community is described, and finally either its strengths and weaknesses are identified, or the burden of a disease is estimated.
In exploratory studies, possible factors influencing an event or outcome are discovered and the result is a hypothesis.
In explanatory (analytical) studies, the relationship between two or more variables is examined, the result of which is to prove the relationship between factors and events or consequences.
Your study does not have any of these characteristics, and it is not clear what the purpose of conducting the study is, and since the purpose is unclear, the main direction of the discussion is also unclear.
Regards

Authors' answers:

1-This is a descriptive study and the authors aim is describing the status of obtaining informed consent in pediatric wards and mentioning the strength and weakness of current process.

2-We tried to explain the aim and purpose of the study clearly in new revision.

Associate Editor 1:

The authors have made some alterations to the paper, as recommended by the reviewers, however some minor modifications will help to improve the quality of this paper.
Abstract:
Results: Total number of respondents should be mentioned with other essential details, like the type of consent, (written or oral, with their percentages). This part should be very specific and only give the figures, (only the result as given in the tables), not what the results 'show'. The last sentence "The results of the study showed that there is no significant association between how informed consent is obtained and the child's age, the number of hospitalizations, and the relation of the person giving informed consent to the children respectively", is actually an interpretation of the results, should be deleted, and, if necessary, included in the discussion or conclusion. The second last sentence "The parents and physicians' answers are similar in some parts but are different in some items like involving parents in making final decision", is extremely vague, if you want to include it you will have to give the exact numbers and details about the "parts and items" that were "similar and or different"
Conclusion: In this section the authors must write what the 'results show'. The present conclusion that has been written is largely encompasses recommendations based on the

conclusion!
In the main body of the paper the authors have written a more valid conclusion, i.e. "The results also showed that there is a gap between the parents and physicians' opinion about the informed consent, as the physicians believe that they act as the patients' parents wish and the parents believe that their opinion plays no important role in final decision regarding the health of their children". This can be rephrased and written as the conclusion in the abstract.
Thank you

Authors' answers:
1-Total number of respondents and type of consent mentioned

2-result part restricted to tables and few phrases regarding only the result of research. Mentioned parts transferred to discussion and conclusion

3- conclusion reviewed totally and revised in some parts. Recommended changes performed.

All changed parts highlighted yellow all over the main text.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 4 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
Comments for the authors:
Abstract:
Reviewed paper is largely acceptable for publication. Please add some relevant details in the Methods section in the abstract to make it clearer; also, please add the number and the type of medical centers, i.e., pediatric hospitals, or general hospitals…etc. You may add the following paragraph after checking it for accuracy.
Method: It is a descriptive study. One hundred eighty-eight caretakers of children admitted in hospitals affiliated with Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences and 23 physicians in care of these patients were enrolled. Two pre-designed, validated questionnaires were utilized in the present study to evaluate the opinion of patients' parents and of their caring physicians about obtaining parental consent for patient management. Questionnaires were handed out after giving necessary explanations to the participants and collected after completion.
SPSS 16 and the one-sample t test method were utilized for statistical analysis of the data.
Body of the paper:
Please check the paper again for errors, for e.g.:
Line 63: Please use the past tense, "was" instead of "will be" in all parts about the method.
Please recheck the paper for the English language. Thank you
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,
My decision about this manuscript is accepting.
Thanks.