Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Volume 12 · Issue 4 · e150816

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Diagnosis of Causative Acute Childhood Viral Diarrhea by Multiplex Real-time PCR Among Children in a Referral Hospital, Tehran, Iran

Maryam Rajabnejad, Leila Azimi, Hannan Khodaei, Abdollah Karimi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
6 Jul 2024	3 Aug 2024	8 Aug 2024	10.5812/apid-150816

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, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

2 comments · 14 Jul 2024 – 21 Jul 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 14 Jul 2024

This manuscript could be revised with full consideration of the following comments:
1. Please use “among” instead of “in hospitalized …” in the title.
2. The study setting and study period should be added in the methods and objective in the abstract section.
3. In the methods, the authors should state how the data were analyzed and reported.
4. The authors made conclusions on the reliability of the Multiplex molecular test. However, they have described the distribution of the causative agents of viral gastroenteritis.
5. English editing is required. For example, what does the following sentence in the introduction section mean: “By recognizing the importance of viral gastroenteritis is crucial for public health efforts, individual well-being, and effective management of outbreaks (10)”?
6. Please do not start the sentence using Arabic numbers.
7. The subheadings in the methods section should be revised. The authors may use “data collection and study setting” instead of “Samples”.
8. The statistical analysis section in the methods should be completely rewritten. Please revise and use the “Statistical analysis” subheading.
9. The sampling methods should be explained.
10. Tables 1 and 2 could be merged into one table. It is better to describe and report some of the tables using figures.
11. The authors should discuss the generalizability of the findings.
12. The conclusion does not support the study objective and findings and needs revision.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 21 Jul 2024

Dear Editor
This manuscript needs minor revision according to the reviewer's comments.
General comments
Methods: The method of sample preparation should be described.
The commercial kit for SARS-COV-2 detection should be specified.
Statistical comments
1. Please use “among” instead of “in hospitalized …” in the title.
2. The study setting and study period should be added to the methods and objective in the abstract section.
3. In the methods, the authors should state how the data were analyzed and reported.
4. The authors drew conclusions about the reliability of the Multiplex molecular test. However, they have described the distribution of the causative agents of viral gastroenteritis.
5. English editing is required. For example, what does the following sentence in the introduction section mean? “Recognizing the importance of viral gastroenteritis is crucial for public health efforts, individual well-being, and effective management of outbreaks (10)”
6. Please do not start the sentence using Arabic numbers.
7. The subheadings in the methods section should be revised. The authors may use “data collection and study setting” instead of “Samples”.
8. The statistical analysis section in the methods should be completely rewritten. Please revise and use the “Statistical analysis” subheading.

9. The sampling methods should be explained.
10. Tables 1 and 2 could be merged into one table. It is better to describe and report some of the tables using figures.
11. The authors should discuss the generalizability of the findings.
12. The conclusion does not support the study objective and findings and needs revision.
Sincerely,

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

Thank you so much for your comments, we revised the manuscript accordingly. All revised were observed by **green** high light in the text.

General comments

methods: the method of sample preparation should be written.

It was added in abstract part, page 1, line 15 and also in methods part in page 3, line 57.

the commercial kit for SARS-COV-2 detection should be written

It was added in the methods part, page 4, line 75 and 76.

Statically comments

1. Please use “among” instead of “in hospitalized …” in the title.
   It was revised in the title, page 1.

   2. The study setting and study period should add in the methods and objective in the abstract section.
   It was added in page 3 and line 56 and 57.

   3. In the methods, the authors should state how the data were analyzed and reported.
   It was added at the end of methods part, page 4. Lines 77- 81

   4. The authors made conclusions on the reliability of the Multiplex molecular test. However, they have described the distribution of the causative agents of viral gastroenteritis.
   It was revised inconclusion part in abstract, page 2, lines 23- 26 and also in the conclusion part of the main text, page 9, lines 145- 151

   5. English editing is required. For example, what does the following sentence mean? “By recognizing the importance of viral gastroenteritis is crucial for public health efforts, individual well-being, and effective management of outbreaks (10)” in the introduction section.
   It was revised in the whole of the manuscript.

6. Please do not start the sentence using Arabic numbers.

They were revised in the whole of the manuscript.

7. The subheadings in the methods section should be revised. The authors may use “data collection and study setting” instead of “Samples”.

It was changed. Page 3. Line 55.

8. The statistical analysis section in the methods should be completely rewritten. Please revise and use the “Statistical analysis” subheading.

It was revised. Page 4, lines 77- 51

9. The sampling methods should be explained.

It was added. Page 3, lines 65- 68

10. Tables 1 and 2 could be merged into one table. It is better to describe and report some of the tables using figures.

The necessary information cannot be put in the combined tables because the information in the tables is of different categories and cannot be classified in one model. Therefore, the tables should be separated from each other.

11. The authors should discuss the generalizability of the findings.

It was added. Page 8, lines 138- 141

12. The conclusion does not support the study objective and findings and needs revision.

It was revised. Page 9, lines 145- 151

Sincerely,

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 5 Aug 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 5 Aug 2024

Dear Editor
The author revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments. So, this manuscript has been accepted and is ready to be published in your journal.

Sincerely,