Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Volume 12 · Issue 3 · e145831

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Variants of Ascitic Fluid Bacterial Infections and Clinical Outcomes in Patients with Liver Cirrhosis

Ramin Niknam, Sara Mansouri, Mohammad Javad Fallahi, Fardad Ejtehadi, Leila Zahiri, Ali Amanati, Vahid Mohammad Karimi, Laleh Mahmoudi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
10 Feb 2024	14 Apr 2024	11 May 2024	10.5812/apid-145831

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, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

3 comments · 22 Feb 2024 – 14 Mar 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 22 Feb 2024

Dear Editor
I would like to inform you that the manuscript could be considered for publication subject to the following comments.
1- The study setting should be introduced in the abstract and the text.
2- The descriptive statistics for Kaplan-Meier analysis, including median survival, should be reported in the results section.
3- How do the authors assess the proportional hazards assumption?
4- Since the authors have included the percentage symbol at the top of the column in the tables, there is no need to add the % sign to the numbers.
5- Please delete the background of the figure.
6- Please report the hazard ratios with two decimal places, not three.

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 22 Feb 2024

Well-written manuscript

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 14 Mar 2024

Dear author
Thanks for submitting your manuscript to this journal. We read this manuscript with interest.
Please respond to the reviewer's comment:
Reviewer 4: I would like to inform you that the manuscript could be considered for publication subject to the following comments.
1- The study setting should be introduced in the abstract and the text.
2- The descriptive statistics for Kaplan-Meier analysis, including median survival, should be reported in the results section.
3- How do the authors consider the proportional hazards assumption?
4- As the authors have included the percentage symbol in the tables' top column, there is no need to add the % sign to the numbers.
5- Please delete the background of the figure.
6- Please report the hazard ratios with two decimal places, not three.
Decision: accept with minor revision
Best Regard
Associate reviewer

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 Editor-in-Chief

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the changes that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly. Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

well-written manuscript.

Thank you.

Reviewer 2:

Dear author

Thanks for submitting your manuscript to pedinfect journal.

I read this manuscript with interest.

We would like to thank you for your positive comment.

Reviewer 3:

Dear Editor

I would like to inform you that the manuscript could be considered as a potential publication subject to the following comments.

1- The study setting should be introduced in the abstract and the text.

Thank you. *The study setting was added and highlighted.*

2- The descriptive statistics on Kaplan- mier including the median of survival should be reported in the result section.

Based on your recommendation, descriptive statistics on Kaplan- Meier including the median of survival are reported in the result section.

3- How do the authors consider the proportionality of hazard assumption?

While we appreciate your valuable feedback, proportional hazards regression modeling is not used in our report, instead, Cox regression analysis was used for survival analysis.

4- As the authors stated the symbol of percentage in the top column in the tables, there is no need to add the % sign for the numbers.

Based on your recommendation, the **changes were done in Table 1-3** *and highlighted.*

5- Please delete the background of the figure.

Based on your recommendation, the background of the figure was deleted.

6- Please report the hazard ratios with two decimal places, not three.

Based on your recommendation, two decimals were used.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear author

Thanks for submitting your manuscript to this journal. We read this manuscript with interest.

Please answer to reviewer's comment:

Reviewer 4: I would like to inform you that the manuscript could be considered as a potential publication subject to the following comments.

1- The study setting should be introduced in the abstract and the text.

2- The descriptive statistics on Kaplan- mier including the median of survival should be reported in the result section.

3- How do the authors consider the proportionality of hazard assumption?

4- As the authors stated the percentage symbol in the tables' top column, there is no need to add the % sign for the numbers.

5- Please delete the background of the figure.

6- Please report the hazard ratios with two decimal places, not three.

Decision: accept with minor revision

Best Regard

We would like to thank you and all of reviewers for their times and valuable point of views. As we explained above by detail, all necessary changes were performed accordingly. I hope you find them satisfactory.

Best Regards

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 10 May 2024 – 10 May 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 10 May 2024

Dear Editor
I would like to inform you that the manuscript has been amended as expected. However, the authors need to consider the following comments:
1- The study setting (location, city, hospital) was not stated clearly.
2- The "proportional hazard assumption" is a requirement to run the Cox regression model. Accordingly, the authors' response to this comment was not appropriate.
Reviewer,

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 10 May 2024

Dear Editor
I want to inform you that the manuscript has been amended as expected. However, the authors need to consider the following comments:
1- The study setting (location, city, hospital) was not stated clearly.
2- The "proportional hazard assumption" is a requirement for running the Cox regression model. Accordingly, the authors' response to this comment was not appropriate.
sincerely you