International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 11 · Issue 1 · e119930

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Pediatric Poisonings Due to Chemical Substances and Related Factors

Noor Mohammad Noori, Tahereh Boryri, Alireza Teimouri, Sahar Safapour Moghadam

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Sep 2021	6 Feb 2022	8 Feb 2022	10.5812/ijhrba-119930

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** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

1 comment · 6 Nov 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 6 Nov 2021

Dear EIC
Thanks for your kind invitations. It is valuable work, but it needs a critical revision.
-Keywords should be selected based on MESH.
-Please describe the characteristics of the hospital where this study was conducted (private, governmental, academic, tertiary, or other).
-The manuscript should be formatted according to the standard journal format.
-The phrase acute poisoning & chemical agents should be completely defined.
-In the methods section, it is not clear who sorted out the files and documented the data. How many files were evaluated, and how many were excluded?
-Due to the retrospective nature of the study, it might have some limitations, such as incomplete files. Please describe the limitations of the study.
-The manuscript should be revised by someone with expertise in English.
Warm 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.

Reviewer 1:

-Keywords should be selected based on MESH. The keywords changes and checked based on MESH.
-Please explain about the characteristics of the hospital where this study was conducted. Private, governmental, academic, tertiary and other. The comment considered and can be seen in the text in the first lines of methodology.
-The manuscript should be designed based on the standard journal format.

Journal format followed by the authors.
-The phrase acute poisoning & chemical agents should be completely defined.

The phrase of acute poisoning defined and chemical agents changed with chemical substances or materials

-In method section, it is not clear who sorted out the files and documented the data. How many files were evaluated and how many were excluded?
-Due to the nature of a retrospective study, the study might have some limitations, such as incomplete files. Please point to the limitations of the study. This section of the comments considered and convincing answers and changes could be seen in the text.

-The manuscript should be revised by someone expert in English. An expert in English checked and modified it.
Warm Regards

Reviewer 2:
Greetings and Regards
The title is vague. It is clear but somehow I changed.
In the introduction, the importance of the issue is not well stated. We tried to state well the importance of the study.
In the method section, more explanation should be given. Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be mentioned. With more explanations I present EXc. And ENc. criteria.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear author,
Reduce the words without affecting the strength of your manuscript and important contents. We decreased the number of sentences that seem have not strong effect in the text.
Reduce the number of words to 5000. After removing some texts without ref. The number of the words is less than 5000 words.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 29 Jan 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 29 Jan 2022

Dear author,
"Highlight" the changes in the main file.
Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations, and "footnotes."
Regards,

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 reviewers

Thank you very much for the valuable comments that surely raising the level of the work.

Editing was done based on grammatical and spelling errors.

Regards

Teimouri

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 8 Feb 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 8 Feb 2022

accept