Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Volume 19 · Issue 1 · e141795

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Diagnostic Values of Blood Indices for Neonatal Sepsis

Maryam Saeedi, Kayvan Mirnia, Maral Ghassemzadeh, Razieh Sangsari, Yasaman Hoseini

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
7 Oct 2023	1 Jan 2024	2 Jan 2024	10.5812/archcid-141795

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

1 comment · 24 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 24 Nov 2023

Dear author
Thank you for your submission.
Overall, all the variables in the method and result sections of this article may need to be rechecked. English editing is mandatory.
Abstract:
Method: Please give a brief explanation of your study. It is not necessary to give the names of the centers in this part.
Introduction:
1-Please don't give a lot of references for one issue. This may decrease the quality of your literature review.
2- Please explain the differences between lab findings in sepsis and non-sepsis cases.
3- What is the meaning of this sentence: "this study was conducted in the Children's Medical Center and Bahrami Children's Hospital two referral hospitals from all over Tehran and Iran in different parts of Tehran."
Method:
1-Please give the definition and criteria for the selection of sepsis cases with an up-to-date reference.
2-Please give your inclusion criteria for culture-negative cases. What is your reference?
3- The definition of cases in the study design can be considered part of the inclusion criteria. Please describe your study process in this part.
4-What are the cases without sepsis, and what exactly were their diseases? Were they admitted? Were they matched with your cases by confounding variables?
5-What is the type of sepsis in your cases, early-onset or late-onset?
6- How did you calculate the sample size? You have three groups; how did you compare them?
7- What is the sampling method?
9- The numbers of cases in the three groups are not equal. Is this statistically acceptable?
10- The tables were not found in the article.
11- Please give the results for all the variables stated in the method section, for example, weight and GA.
DISCUSSION
1- The majority of the first and second parts of the discussion belong in the result section.
2- Please check all the result sections one by one, compare their results with yours, and give your explanation.
3- Please explain the advantages and disadvantages of your study in this part, not in the conclusion section.
Best Regards

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
Thank you for your comments
Totally this article might recheck for all the variables in method and result part. English edition is mandatory
We correct them.
Abstract:
Method: pls give a brief explanation of your study. It is not necessary to give the name of centers in this part
.We explained a brief and changed that
:Introduction
Pls don't give a lot of references for one issue. This may decrease the quality of your Review of-1 Literature
We correct them
PLS explain about the differences between lab findings in sepsis and non-sepsis cases -2
We explained them
What is the meaning of this sentence "this study was conducted in the Children's Medical -3 Center and Bahrami Children's Hospital two referral hospitals from all over Tehran and Iran in .different parts of Tehran
We deleted this sentence
:Method
Pls give the definition and criteria for selection of sepsis cases with uptodate reference-*1*
We defined and correct them
?Pls give your inclusion criteria for culture negative cases. What is your reference-2
We correct themt
definition of cases in study design can assumed as inclusion criteria, pls give your study -3 process in this part
We correct them
What are the cases with no sepsis, what was their disease exactly? Were they admitted? Were -4 ?they matched with your cases by confounding variables
The neonates who were admitted for reasons other than infection, such as hyperbilirubinemia, not severe ones. The severity was based on AAP gaud line for hyperbilirubinemia
5-What is the type of sepsis in your cases, early onset or late onset?
We defined them
6- how did you calculate the sample size, you have three groups, how did you compare them?
The number of sepsis patients was based on the time period and collection of non-sepsis cases was very difficult, a neonate with moderate hyperbilirubinemia without sepsis rarely admitted in referral hospitals then the control group had small size.
7- what is the sampling method?
The number of sepsis patients was based on the time period
8- the number of cases in three groups are not equal . is it ok statistically?
The collection of non-sepsis cases was very difficult, a neonate with moderate hyperbilirubinemia without sepsis rarely admitted in referral hospitals then the control group had small size.
9- The tables were not found in article

We correct those
11- Pls give all the variables results that are stated in method part for example weight and GA
We added them
DISCUSSION
1- The majority of first and second part of discussion belongs to result part
We correct that
2- Pls check all the result parts one by one and compare their results with yours and give your explanation .
We correct that
3- Pls explain the advantages and disadvantages of your study in this part not in conclusion part.
We correct that
Best Regards

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.