International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism
Volume 21 · Issue 4 · e137594

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Determinants of Bone Mineral Density in Iranian Women with Polycystic Ovary Syndrome

Fariba Karimi, Parisa Mardani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
23 May 2023	8 Sep 2023	25 Sep 2023	10.5812/ijem-137594

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 Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 Revision 2 Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

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.

The answers to the reviewers' comments

First of all, it is necessary to appreciate the valuable comments and suggestions of the respected judges. Our answers to each of the reviewers are highlighted with a separate color (reviewer#1 yellow and reviewer#2 green).

Reviewer#1

1-The title of the manuscript was changed to "Determinants of bone mineral density in Iranian women with polycystic ovary syndrome."

2. In key words, insulin resistance was used instead of "homeostatic model assessment of insulin resistance".

3. The background section was revised and the recommendations were applied.

4. Objective section was corrected.

5. Characteristics and sensitivity of the kits were added to the method section.

6. Physical activity was defined in method.

7. In method section, sera was added to the text, according to the recommendation.

8. Statistical analysis was written below the tables.

9. In Table 1, weight was revised to body weight.

10-Also, previous Table 2 was added to Table 1 in the revised article.

11. The strengths and limitations of the present study were added before conclusion.

12. Discussion and conclusion were summarized.

13. English writing was checked and edited.

Reviewer#2

1-The comments regarding the sample size calculation were added to the method section.

This study calculated the sample size using NCSS (PASS) software. At the error level of alpha = 0.05 and power=80%, and based on the difference in the mean levels of bone density in the two groups and their standard deviation in previous similar study (Ref#12) (1.058±0.12 in PCOS subjects and 1.21±0.18 in control group), the minimum number of participants in two groups was determined $n_1=n_2 = [(Z_{\alpha/2} + Z_{\beta})^2 \times \{2(ó)^2\}]/ (\mu1 - \mu2)^2$. However, we included more subjects to apply regression models.

Our sample size was small due to our financial limitations. It was mentioned in the study's limitations as an explanation for the lack of significant difference in terms of BMD, which could result in inadequate power.

2-The univariate and multivariate regression analysis results in the two groups were provided separately and shown in Tables 3 and 4.

3-More details regarding the sampling frame were added in the method section.

4-The matrix of correlations is provided in Table 2 and previous Table 2 was added to Table 1 in revised article.

5-The absolute values of physical activity are mentioned in Table 1.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 2 Sep 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 2 Sep 2023

In the revised manuscript, the majority of comments on the different sections have been addressed, and the corresponding changes have been made. However, some points still need to be addressed.
1) The exact value of the calculated sample size should be reported. Moreover, it is not clear which region (spine or hip) was selected in this regard.
2) Unnecessary decimal places should be deleted from the tables.
3) In Table 2, osteocalcin and PTH should be moved to the columns.

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.

Respond to reviewers

We appreciate the respected judges again. Our answers to the comments are highlighted.

1-The exact value of the calculated sample size should be reported. Moreover, it is not clear which region (spine or hip) was selected in this regard
The exact value of the calculated sample size was reported and the lumbar spine as the selected region was mentioned.

2- Unnecessary decimal places should be deleted from the tables

Unnecessary decimal places were deleted from the tables.

3- In Table 2, osteocalcin and PTH should be moved to the columns

In table 2, osteocalcin and PTH were moved to the columns and the appropriate correlations were recorded between osteocalcin and PTH and bone parameters.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 17 Sep 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 17 Sep 2023

I have no further comment.