Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 32 · Issue 1 · e112155

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Risk Analysis of Re-displacement After Conservative Treatment of Pediatric Unstable Fractures of Middle and Distal Forearm

Dapeng Xu, Rong Qin, Wuyu Wang, Jun Shen, Aiguo Zhang, Xiaodong Wang

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
3 Jan 2021	10 Oct 2021	19 Nov 2021	10.5812/ijp.112155

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** Soroush Baghdadi 2
2 **Revision 1** Soroush Baghdadi 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

1 comment · 16 Jul 2021

Soroush Baghdadi Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 16 Jul 2021

I thank the authors of the manuscript titled “Analysis of the redisplacement risk after conservative treatment of unstable fracture of middle and distal forearm in children” for their work.

In this manuscript, the authors have evaluated 167 children with forearm fractures to determine the risk factors for redisplacement after initial casting. They have found that both-bone fractures, initial reduction, and the cast’s soft tissue index were predictive of redisplacement.

I commend the authors for their work. However, it is obvious that the text has been translated from Chinese, and many words and phrases are lost in translation. I will point out a few obvious errors, but the text needs to be edited by someone who is familiar with medical literature. Examples include ‘self-shaping ability’, ‘up to date’, ‘gypsum’, ‘lateral slice’, ‘normal slice’, and several other instances.

1) The number of patients is reported in the purpose paragraph, which should be removed. It is also mentioned again in the methods and results. Only keep one of them.

2) The introduction should be revised. I don’t agree with the sentence in line 32-33. There are many papers with a sound methodology in the literature.

3) Line 63: “If conservative treatment was available, outpatient follow-up was performed. Otherwise, surgical treatment was performed.” This is not an acceptable surgical indication.

4) The authors should also add the results of a multivariate logistic regression.

5) The data in the tables do not correspond with the data in the text and abstract. Both-bone forearm fracture is not a significant risk factor in table 2, but it is mentioned in the discussion and abstract.

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 Prof. Vahid Ziaee:

Thank you for your suggestions as well as the Reviewer's comments on our manuscript entitled "**Analysis of the redisplacement risk after conservative treatment of unstable fracture of middle and distal forearm in children**". We are happy that the Reviewers commended our work.

We have tried our best to address all of the concerns raised by the Editor and the Reviewers and revised the manuscript. We hope that this manuscript is now acceptable for publication in **Iran J Pediatr**. Detailed responses are attached.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

With best regards,
Sincerely yours

Detailed Responses to Reviewer #1:

General comments: I thank the authors of the manuscript titled "Analysis of the redisplacement risk after conservative treatment of unstable fracture of middle and distal forearm in children" for their work.

In this manuscript, the authors have evaluated 167 children with forearm fractures to determine the risk factors for redisplacement after initial casting. They have found that both bone fractures, initial reduction, and the cast's soft tissue index were predictive of a redisplacement.

I commend the authors for their work. However, it is obvious that the text has been translated from Chinese, and many words and phrases are lost in translation. I will point out a few obvious errors, but the text needs to be edited by someone who is familiar with medical literature. For example, 'self-shaping ability', 'up to date', 'gypsum', 'lateral slice', 'normal slice', and several other instances.

Response:

We thank the Reviewer for the positive comments about our study. We are deeply sorry for the wording errors in the language. We have rewritten most of the content of the article and made changes as suggested.

(Q1) The number of patients are reported in the purpose paragraph, which should be removed. It is also mentioned again in the methods and results. Only keep one of them.

Response:

As suggested, we have removed the number of patients in the purpose paragraph. (Highlighted in red in line 50-54)

(Q2) Introduction should be revised. I don't agree with the sentence in line 32-33. There are many papers with a sound methodology in the literature.

Response:

Thank you for your reminder. After reviewing it again, we verified that their methodology was correct. As suggested, we have revised Introduction part. (Highlighted in red in line 42-43)

(Q3) Line 63: "If conservative treatment was available, outpatient follow-up was performed. Otherwise, surgical treatment was performed." This is not an acceptable surgical

indication.

Response:

Thank you for your reminder. We are very sorry for the inaccurate description of the surgical indication. As suggested, we have revised the surgical indication. (Highlighted in red in line 152-154)

(Q4) The authors should also add the results of a multivariate logistic regression.

Response:

Thank you very much for your suggestion. But our retrospective analysis has only two possibilities, displacement and non-displacement. We still believe that binary logistic regression analysis is more appropriate.

(Q5) The data in the tables do not correspond with the data in the text and abstract. Both-bone forearm fracture is not a significant risk factor in table 2, but it is mentioned in the discussion and abstract.

Response:

We are very sorry for the data error. As suggested, we have revised the discussion and abstract. (Highlighted in red in line 23-25, 117-120)

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 14 Nov 2021

Soroush Baghdadi Reviewer

ACCEPT 14 Nov 2021

I thank the authors of this paper for their revision. They have managed to address all of my comments. I should also point out that there is nothing to be sorry about when it comes to English writing. As long as the manuscript is legible for the average reader and there are no gross errors, it is fine.

Overall, I think the paper is ready to be published.