Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 32 · Issue 4 · e116661

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Ventilation Methods and Cardiorespiratory Outcomes in Children with Foreign Body Aspiration Undergoing Rigid Bronchoscopy Within 2008 - 2019

Arman Parvizi, Soudabeh Haddadi, Mohammad Babaei, Shadman Nemati, Ehsan Kazemnezhad Leili

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
9 Jun 2021	9 May 2022	17 May 2022	10.5812/ijp-116661

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

1 Original submission

2 comments · 4 Jul 2021 – 26 Nov 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 4 Jul 2021

1. What were the criteria for determining the ventilator method?
2. It seems better to reduce the length of the abstract.
3. The keyword does not match MeSH.
4. There are numerous new studies that can be cited in the introduction to emphasize the importance of the issue.
5. Statistical analysis needs further explanation and clarification.
6. According to the findings, a more reasoned discussion is expected. For this purpose, the findings can be compared with the pros and cons of more up-to-date research.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 26 Nov 2021

Thanks for inviting me to review this manuscript. The authors have conducted a cross-sectional study to compare the cardiovascular and respiratory outcomes following the use of ventilation methods in patients with foreign body aspiration who underwent rigid bronchoscopy.
This seems to be interesting to readers. However, I have some concerns about the manuscript:
1) The authors need to specify what the pulmonary problems are.
2) There are several methods for ventilation-assisted rigid bronchoscopy, like jet ventilation and …. The authors need to specify the details of the assisted ventilation group and the settings for the device used for this purpose. For example, the authors should specify the volume, pressure, and PEEP, and …
3) The authors should be careful when interpreting the results because of several confounders. For instance, anesthesia parameters and drugs could have considerable effects on blood pressure and cardiovascular outcomes that can obscure the conclusion. Did you correct or match the patients for anesthetic drugs?
4) The authors also need a limitations section.

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 chief editor of Iranian Journal of Pediatrics

We read your valuable comments and tried to correct our manuscript and they are yellow highlighted.

Response to Reviewer1

Q1.What were the criteria for determining the ventilator method?

R1 .Either controlled ventilation or spontaneous respiration is commonly used in general anesthesia for inhaled foreign body removal via rigid bronchoscopy. (References 15,16,17) Although both methods of spontaneous respiration and controlled ventilation during anesthesia are safe and effective for managing children with foreign body aspiration, there is no consensus from the literature as to which technique is optimal.(Reference17)

Q2. . It seems better to reduce the volume of the abstract.

R2.The volume of the abstract was reduced.

Q3. The keyword does not match the MeSh.

R3. The keywords were matched the MeSh.

Q4. There are numerous and new studies that can be cited in the introduction to emphasize the importance of the issue.

R4. Some new studies were added and cited in the introduction to emphasize the importance of the issue.

Q5. Statistical analysis needs further explanation and clarification.

R5. Some explanation was added to statistical analysis .

Q6. According to the findings, a more reasoned discussion is expected. For this purpose, the findings can be compared with the pros and cons of more up-to-date research.

R6.Discussion was added based on our findings and pros and cons researchs.

Response to Reviewer 2:

Q1. The author need to specifically what are the pulmonary problems are.

R1) The pulmonary problems were investigated laryngospasm, hypoxemia ,laryngeal edema ,pneumonia.

Q2. There are several methods for ventilation-assisted rigid bronchoscopy like jet ventilation and …. The authors need to specify the detail of assisted ventilation group and settings for the device used for this purpose. For example, the authors should specify the volume, pressure and peep, and …

R2) About ventilation ,there are some controversies , but Either controlled ventilation or spontaneous respiration is commonly used in general anesthesia for inhaled foreign body removal via rigid bronchoscopy.(15,16,17)

Q3. *) The authors should be about the interpretation of results due to several confounders. For instance, anesthesia parameters and drugs could have considerable effects on blood pressure and cardiovascular outcomes that can obscure the conclusion. Did you correct or match the patients for anesthetic drugs?*

R3) Anesthesia plan was the same in two groups and it was discussed and explained .

Q4. The author needs also a limitation section.

R4)Limitation section was added.

Best Regards

P. A. , H. S.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.