Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Volume 14 · Issue 1 · e159400

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating the Impact of Coronavirus Disease 2019 on Women's Inclination or Disinclination Toward Childbearing

Arghavan Afra, Elham Senisel bachari, Mehdi Khedmati, Shima Seneysel Bachari, Naser Kamyari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
5 Jan 2025	18 May 2025	15 Jul 2025	10.5812/apid-159400

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, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 9
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

2 comments · 17 Jan 2025 – 10 Feb 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

REJECT 17 Jan 2025

General comments:

1. The introduction section of the manuscript should describe the gap in knowledge and the significance of the topic. Although the authors have tried to consider the journal's aims and scope in the title of the manuscript by using "COVID-19" as an investigated factor, this manuscript is not aligned with the journal's scope.

Specific comments:
Abstract:
1. The study period is not stated.
2. The study design should be written as "Cross- Sectional Study".
3. "Healthcare centers" could be replaced with "PHC Centers affiliated to Abadan ....".
4. The authors have stated the names of the statistical tests and models. This could be rewritten to explain the purpose of using such tests and how the findings were reported.
5. Findings were reported subjectively without reporting objective results such as measures of association (OR).
6. The conclusion of the abstract and main manuscript is general and not specific.
Main text:
7. The introduction section should describe the gap in knowledge and the significance of the study.
8. The methods section could be improved, especially in terms of how the sample size was estimated and in terms of English language editing (Line 108).
9. The tables should be revised, and values (frequencies) should be reported as N(%), not (%22/5) 55. The decimal points should be reported using ".", not "/."
10. The conclusion should provide a specific message with public health implications.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 10 Feb 2025

Editor's comments
Your manuscript has passed the review stage and is ready for revision.

To ensure the Editor and Reviewers can recommend that your revised manuscript be accepted, please pay careful attention to each comment posted underneath this email. This way we can avoid future clarifications and revisions, moving swiftly to a decision.

Technical points:
1. Please provide a point-by-point response to the Editor's and reviewers' comments.
2. Please highlight all the changes in your manuscript in yellow.
3. Use line numbering and page numbers in the next submission.
4. Improve the English language of the manuscript.

Editor's main concerns:
Setting: The study was conducted in healthcare centers under the supervision of Abadan University of

Medical Sciences, but specific dates are not mentioned. Specific dates for the study setting and data collection are not provided.

Data Sources/Measurement: The authors did not mention specific efforts to address bias.

Study Size: The rationale for the sample size is not provided.

Statistical Methods: Details on controlling for confounding factors in statistical methods are missing.

Results
Participants: The study included 245 women, but further details on participant flow are not provided.

Discussion: No mention of limitations or generalizability of the study results.

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 Associate Editor's and reviewers:
Thank you to you and the esteemed referees for their patience and thorough review of the submitted article.

Reviewer1:

The study period is not stated.

Reply to the reviewer:

The study period was mentioned.

.

Study design should be written as "Cross- Sectional Study".

Reply to the reviewer:

Study design was written as "Cross- Sectional Study".

Healthcare centers" could be replaced with "PHC Centers affiliated to Abadan ....".

Reply to the reviewer:

Replaced Healthcare centers throughout the text.

The authors have stated the names of the statistical tests and models. This could be rewritten using the aim of using such tests and how they reported the findings.

Reply to the reviewer:

The names of the statistical tests and models was mentioned.

Findings were reported subjectively without reporting objective results such as measures of association (OR).

Reply to the reviewer:

The Findings was edited and OR was mentioned.

The conclusion of the abstract and main manuscript is general and not specific.

Reply to the reviewer:

The *conclusion of the abstract and main manuscript* were edited.

The introduction section should provide the gap in knowledge and significance of the study.

Reply to the reviewer:

The *introduction section* was edited

The methods section could be improved, especially in terms of how the sample size was estimated and in the English edition (Line 108).

Reply to the reviewer:

The sampling formula and how to calculate the sample size were mentioned.

The tables should be revised, and values (frequencies) should be reported as N(%) not (%22/5) 55. The decimal points should be reported using "." not "/."

Reply to the reviewer:

The tables were edited.

The conclusion should provide a specific message with public health implication.

Reply to the reviewer:

The conclusion was edited.

Reviewer2:

There are some additional and unrelated content in the background section of the manuscript, please review it.

Reply to the reviewer:

The *introduction section* was edited

You can Add objective section to background section and not consider it as a separate section.

Reply to the reviewer:

The objectives section is written as a separate section according to the magazine format.

Please provide a detailed and complete explanation of how to determine the sample size and the software used.

Reply to the reviewer:

how to determine the sample size and the software used was mentioned.

In Table 1, the frequency percentage is not stated in some cells, please correct it.

In Table 1, in some rows the sum does not equal 100. Please correct it.

Reply to the reviewer:

The table 1 was edited.

What tests did you use in Table 3? Please indicate the tests used below the table.

Reply to the reviewer:

The *tests* were mentioned in table 3.

Where did you use logistic regression? Did you use univariate or multivariate logistic regression?

Reply to the reviewer:

Univariate logistic regression was used. It is shown in Table 3.

Please mark the significant variables with an asterisk in Table 3.

Reply to the reviewer:

the significant variables with an asterisk in Table 3 were marked.

Please mark the significant variables with an asterisk in Table 3.

Reply to the reviewer:

the significant variables with an asterisk in Table 3 were marked.

Reviewer 3:

It is better to pay attention to all the factors in the title, if only the Covid factor is mentioned.

Reply to the reviewer:

The present study aimed to investigate the impact of COVID-19 on women's inclination or disinclination for childbearing in Healthcare centers affiliated to Abadan University of Medical Sciences.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 8 May 2025 – 11 May 2025

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 8 May 2025

Dear Authors,
Reviewer #2 has submitted additional comments, necessitating a new round of revisions for your manuscript. Please provide a detailed point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments and highlight all changes made to your manuscript in yellow.
Best regards,

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 11 May 2025

Dear authors,
Expert reviewers in the field have evaluated your manuscript with ID 159400, “title: Investigating the Impact of Coronavirus Disease 2019 on Women's Inclination or Disinclination toward Childbearing”.
According to the reviewer's comments, this manuscript needs minor revision. The authors have to submit the revised manuscript along with a point-by-point response to the reviewer comments.

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's and reviewers:
Thank you to you and the esteemed referees for their patience and thorough review of the submitted article.

Reviewer:

Comment 1: In line 98, you stated that "stratified regression analyses were performed across relevant covariates" where did you report the results of stratified regression analyses? Please explain about it.

Reply to the reviewer:

In the logistic regression analysis presented in Table 3, the independent variables were entered into the model to examine their effect on the main variable. As shown, the p-values reported in Table 2 indicate the significant and relevant variables within the model. A p-value of less than 0.05 denotes statistically significant variables.

Comment 2: In Table 3, the odds ratio (OR) values for the variables "number of children" and "History of Covid 19" are reported as zero, and statistical significance is provided for only one row. Such reporting of results is incorrect. Please provide the reasoning behind this discrepancy.

Reply to the reviewer:

the odds ratio (OR) was revised and for each variable was also reported.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 1 Jul 2025 – 15 Jul 2025

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 1 Jul 2025

dear authors, thank you for addressing my comments. I believe that this manuscript is publishable.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 12 Jul 2025

The authors have effectively utilized all available resources and data to revise the manuscript in a manner that is more scientifically sound than previously. In my opinion and based on the respected reviewers' comments, the manuscript could be published in its current form.
Yours,

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 15 Jul 2025

My decision about this manuscript is to accept it.