International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 11 · Issue 3 · e127438

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Clinical, Socioeconomic, and Demographic Factors in Different Poisoning Agents in Pediatric Population

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

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 Jun 2022	8 Sep 2022	15 Sep 2022	10.5812/ijhrba-127438

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** zahra ghiasi, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 2 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 12
Authors' reply to reviewers 13
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

4 comments · 4 Aug 2022 – 13 Aug 2022

zahra ghiasi Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 4 Aug 2022

Topic:
Why did you use "changes" in the topic? This word implicitly refers to the comparison of differences, but this study is not a comparative study. You can change your topic to "Effective demographic, Clinical and socio-economic factors in childhood poisoning". Your current topic is ambiguous.
Abstract:
In the methods section, mention the sampling method, sample size, and statistical method.
The conclusion section is the same as the results section. The final sentences of an abstract should concisely summarize your study's conclusions, implications, or applications to practice and, if appropriate, can be followed by a statement about the need for additional research revealed by the findings. So rewrite that.
Your keywords, except "children", are not selected from Mesh Terms.
Background:
The contents of this section are disjointed, but they are presented in consecutive sentences that are not coherent. Separate the contents from each other by paragraphing and add appropriate connecting links.
In the introduction, information about what we know, what we don't know, and what we want to know in this study should be presented. In this section, it is necessary to refer to internal studies, especially regarding the geographical area in question, to reveal the existing knowledge gap and the necessity of conducting such a study.
Line 35 has some problems. Revise it.
Line 39: Mention the year in which the study was conducted and state the time period and country to which the death rate refers.
Please rewrite this sentence in a simpler and more specific way: "This study was conducted to highlight preventative measures that should be taken by revealing outbreaks of child poisoning in Zahedan, Sistan and Balochistan, Iran, which may lead to the identification of risk factors."

Methodology:
The sentence in lines 66 and 67 has a problem; correct it.
The number of participants, inclusion and exclusion criteria, sampling method, and sample size calculation method should be mentioned.

Results:
Fix the writing problems in line 103.
"The agent of poisoning had a significant on days stayed in hospital ($X2=60.027$, $p<0.001$)." Had a significant what?

Discussion:
This is the section where you need to present the importance of your study and how it may be able to contribute to and/or fill existing gaps in the field, but you have summarized this section inappropriately.
Follow these items and rewrite this section:
Begin with a clear statement of the principal findings. Explain why the outcomes of your study are important to the reader.
Discuss the implications of your findings realistically based on previous literature, highlighting both the strengths and limitations of the research.
State whether the results prove or disprove your hypothesis. If your hypothesis was disproved, what might be the reasons?

Introduce new or expanded ways to think about the research question. Indicate what next steps can be taken to further pursue any unresolved questions.
Be concise!

Conclusion:
Mention the limitations. Make recommendations based on the findings and identify future directions for research.

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT — 13 Aug 2022

Dear author,
The different parts of the article were well designed, with no problems.
regards,

Associate Editor — MAJOR REVISION — 13 Aug 2022

major revision

Editor-in-Chief — MAJOR REVISION — 13 Aug 2022

Dear author,
Highlight the changes in the main file.
Answer the comments completely, one by one, in the reply to reviewers file.
Comment 1: …
Response 1: …
Reconsider the limitation, conclusions, ethical considerations, and footnotes.
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.

Letter responding to the reviewers

Reviewer 1:

Topic:

Why you used "changes" in topic. This word implicitly refers to the comparison of differences, but this study is not a comparative study. You can change your topic to "Effective demographic, Clinical and socio-economic factors in childhood poisoning". Your current topic is ambiguous.

If the reviewer sees the t itle, analysis and the discussion, easily can finds that, the aim of the study is comparing demographic, clinical and socio-economic factors in different agents of childhood poisoning. But We changed the topic as the respected reviewer recommended.

Abstract:

In method section mention sampling method, number of sample and statistical method.

I revised and added corrected this section, please see the attached file.

Conclusion part is the same as results. It changed see the main file

while the final sentences of an abstract concisely summarize your study's conclusions, implications, or applications to practice and, if appropriate, can be followed by a statement about the need for additional research revealed from the findings. So rewrite that.

Your keywords except "children" are not selected from Mesh Terms. All changed base on the title and Mesh approaches

Background:

The contents in this section are disjointed, but they are given in consecutive sentences that are not coherent. Separate the contents from each other by paragraphing and add appropriate connecting links.

In the introduction, information about what we know, what we don't know and what we want to know in this study should be presented. After revision, easy can find what we know, what we don't know and what we want to know

In this section, it is necessary to refer to internal studies, especially regarding the geographical area in question, to reveal the existing knowledge gap and the necessity of conducting such a study. NOW, some of the studies are from Iran

Line 35 has some problems. Revise it. REVISED
Line 39: Mention the year of conducting the study and state the death rate in which time period and in which country. CORRECTED AND REVISED
Please rewrite this sentence in a simpler and more specific way: "This study was conducted to highlight preventative measures that should be taken by revealing outbreaks of child poisoning in Zahedan, Sistan and Balochistan, Iran, which may lead to the identification of risk factors." THE SENTENCE CHANGED SOMEWHO EASILY COULD BE UNDERSTAND

Methodology:
The sentence written in line 66 and 67 has a problem, correct it. CORRECTED
The number of sample people, inclusion and exclusion criteria, sampling method, sample size calculation method should be mentioned.
This is census, mean all admitted children during the years entered to the study
Results:
Fix writing problems in line 103. Corrected and the problem fixed
"The agent of poisoning had a significant on days stayed in hospital (X2=60.027,

p<0.001)." had a significant what?

Discussion: discussion rewrote and some comparative aspect added
This is the section where you need to present the importance of your study and how it may be able to contribute to and/or fill existing gaps in the field but You have summarized this section inappropriately. Follow these items and rewrite this section:
Begin with a clear statement of the principal findings. Explain why the outcomes of your study are important to the reader.
Discuss the implications of your findings realistically based on previous literature, highlighting both the strengths and limitations of the research.
State whether the results prove or disprove your hypothesis. If your hypothesis was disproved, what might be the reasons?
Introduce new or expanded ways to think about the research question. Indicate what next steps can be taken to further pursue any unresolved questions.
Be concise!

Conclusion:
*Mention the limitations. Make recommendations based on the findings and identify future directions for research.we added this sentences to obey the comments by the reviewer '*It is recommended for running comprehensive training programs for mothers who their children are most at poisoning risk and there is a need for more studies on drug poisoning specially children in this kind of regions in future".

Reviewer 2:
Dear author,
the different parts of article had good design with no problem.
regards,

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 3 Sep 2022

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 3 Sep 2022

Topic:
The word " change" refers to a comparison of the assessments before and after the independent variable is applied. You are checking the differences here. So either you should use the term "assessment" or "evaluation"!

Again, in the method section of the abstract, you did not mention the number of samples, the statistical method, or the sampling method!
Some of your keywords are not yet included in MeshTerm. You should check your keywords on the site below and use them if they are listed.
https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/
Make sure that the introduction section specifies the necessity of your study. It should identify the lack of studies in this specific field in this specific geographical location and convince the reader of the article that it was necessary to conduct this research and that its results add to the body of knowledge in this field and are not repetitions.
In line 178: do you mean a significant relationship? Or a correlation?
In the discussion section, you should not refer to relevant studies for the first time and explain each one in detail. Rather, you should present different studies in the background section, and in the discussion section, after stating each of the results, name the studies mentioned earlier in the introduction that are consistent and inconsistent with your results and provide a specific explanation. With respect, please rewrite this section.

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.

Related to:

Evaluation of Clinical, socio-economic and demographic factors' in different agent poisonings in pediatric population

The title changed based on the comments.

Keywords selected from MeSh.

Introduction a little changed to show the study importance.

The discussion rewritten partially based on the comment.

Regards

Teimouri

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

4

Revision 3

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.

Related to:

Evaluation of Clinical, socio-economic and demographic factors' in different agent poisonings in pediatric population

To Whom It May Concern

Dear

Respectfully, we deleted useless results and reports from the findings section without losing the main outcomes. And, for each agents, we reported the sub-causes of poisoning.

In the discussion section, as much as possible, we merged similar results, but for a good discussion, for some of the studies, it was not possible because of probable differences in methodology, study population and the subjects' age.

Hope this revision would be accepted and I have to say thank you for these attempts for more validation of our study.

Regards

Teimouri

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 15 Sep 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 15 Sep 2022

accept