Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Volume 10 · Issue 4 · e121163

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Prevalence of Preterm Births and Complications of Prematurity: A Comparison Between First Year of COVID-19 Pandemic and the Previous Year

farzaneh Palizban, Naeeme Taslimi Taleghani, Maryam Khoshnood Shariati, Minoo Fallahi, Sedigheh Tehranchi, Hanieh Najafiarab

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
27 Dec 2021	30 May 2022	30 Jun 2022	10.5812/pedinfect-121163

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 9
3 Revision 2 Referee 1 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Dear reviewer,

Thanks for your constructive comments. According to reviewer and editors comments, we rewrite the manuscript completely, especially method and result sections. Changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. The manuscript was also edited by an English editor. The answers to your comments are as follows:

1-An interesting topic has been studied, but the manuscript has many mistakes and are not clear (some highlighted). Therefore, the manuscript needs full English edition.

The manuscript was edited by an English editor.

2-In this article, in addition to distribution of preterm births, incidence of complications of prematurity during the first year of COVID-19 pandemic compared with one year prior to it, but in the title and in the abstract did not reflect these contents appropriately.

We edited title and abstract, in which we mentioned the above points.

3-Table 1 and 2 must not be mentioned in method.

Done.

4-It is better that p value of difference of frequency in each gestational age between two period of time add in Table 1. You can use graph as an alternative to table 1.

We added the risk differences and p-value of them to the Table 1.

5-Table 2 need revision, and 98 and 99(highlight) must be changed with 2019-2020 2020-2021.

Instead of Table 2, we added charts and corrected the comments mentioned.

6-In the discussion;

“like previous study” reference must be determined.

Reference was added.

“Determining the mean of preterm frequencies in larger intervals may help to reduce bias in outcomes” why?? Larger intervals may increase bias due to improvement and changes in management during years.

This sentence was deleted from the text.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

Dear associate editor 1,

Thanks for your constructive comments. According to reviewer and editors comments, we rewrite the manuscript completely, especially method and result sections. Changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. The manuscript was also edited by an English editor. The answers to your comment are as follows:

Dear author

Please explain the relationship between statistical analysis and the results obtained and the reason for using each of the analysis methods.

Regards

We used only the chi-square test to compare values between categories. This sentence corrected in the method section.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

Dear associate editor 2,

Thanks for your constructive comments. According to reviewer and editors comments, we rewrite the manuscript completely, especially method and result sections. Changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. The manuscript was also edited by an English editor.

Dear authors

Your manuscript has now passed through the review stage and is ready for revision.

We revised the manuscript fundamentally.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

Dear Editor in Chief,

Thanks for your constructive comments. According to reviewer and editors comments, we rewrite the manuscript completely, especially method and result sections. Changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. The manuscript was also edited by an English editor.

To ensure the Editor and Reviewers will be able to recommend that your revised manuscript is accepted, please pay careful attention to each of the comments that have been pasted underneath this email. This way we can avoid future rounds of clarifications and revisions, moving swiftly to a decision.

1. Please provide a point-by-point response to the comments.

We responded provide a point-by-point response.

2. Please highlight all the amends on your manuscript.

We highlighted editions in the text.

3. Use line numbering and page number in the next submission.

Done.

4. Improve the English language of the manuscript (strongly recommended.(

The manuscript was edited by an English editor.

Other shortcomings

Abstract, the "results" section is uninformative except for one reported p-value. Improve this section appropriately.

We rewrite the abstract section.

Method section:

Specify the "logistic regression" test name.

I did not find any specific analysis performed by "logistic regression" in this study.

All comparisons in Tables 1 and 2 could be obtained by the chi-square test.

We used only the chi-square test to compare values between categories. This sentence corrected in the method section.

Results section:

Should be improved extensively.

We rewrite the result section.

Add study limitations at the end of the discussion part.

Done.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Dear associate editor,

Thanks for your review and constructive comments. Based on your comments, we edited the manuscript (highlighted with yellow color). Also below, we answered your comments one by one.

1-In my opinion, the authors could use the "Joinpoint Regression Program" using the monthly term/preterm rate, ROP, RDS, sepsis, and IVH during the study period to find breakpoints.

We should enter independent, dependent, and by-variables in “Joinpoint regression program” to find breakpoints. Since our study had no by-variable, we cannot adjust dependent variables (preterm/term births, RDS, ROP, IVH, and sepsis) and find breakpoints. Instead, we added Figure 5, which shows the time trend of preterm/term births and complications of prematurity.

2-Results presented in the abstract section (lines 19-22) are not similar to the results presented in the main manuscript (lines 77-82).

We edited this section similar to what we wrote in the main text.

3-Lines 82-83: replace "charts" with "Figures", also correct figure legends accordingly.

Done.

4-Lines 131-133: add heading for the conclusion section.

Done.

5-finally, since the data are based on general term/prematurity statistics in the region, it is strongly recommended to apply statistical adjustments using global reference term/preterm data.

Global statistics for preterm births during COVID-19 lockdown are unavailable. But, researchers conducted some studies reporting regional statistics. The most comprehensive article on this subject is a meta-analysis study that we have added to the discussion section (reference no. 12).

Best regards,

Corresponding author

Dear editor in chief,

We revised the manuscript based on associate editor’s comments. We hope that the new version is suitable for publication in your journal.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 17 Jun 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Jun 2022

Dear Author
Thank you for the revisions.
Regards