Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 32 · Issue 6 · e121462

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Critically Ill Paediatric Patients in the Adult ICU

Mehmet Salih Sevdi, Kerem Erkalp

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
27 Nov 2021	13 Aug 2022	21 Aug 2022	10.5812/ijp-121462

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 farima zakaryaei 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 Revision 2 Referee 1 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8

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.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your and the reviewers' comments about our article *(Evaluation of critically ill paediatric patients in the adult ICU: A 10-year retrospective study, manuscript ID:121462)***.**

We have read them and answered all the comments one by one below. We made the necessary revision regarding our article.

Best regards.

Comment of Reviewer 1:

"Your article needs a major review. Please resubmit the article after reviewing." **We have made a major review all of the article.**

Comments of Reviewer 2:

"First of all, your article must be checked by a native English speaker. There are many spelling and grammatical errors; maybe that's why I had difficulty understanding the report." **Our article was re-checked by us and an international editing company, and the necessary language adjustments were made. The Editing Certificate was also added, again.**

"In the abstract:

-The number of cases should be delete from the methods and should be added to the result." **Done**

"-In the result percentage of each of the complications (pulmonary problems, septic shock, multi-organ failure and cardiovascular system diseases) should be added." **Done**

"-The p-value of each one should be written (low age, high Pediatric Mortality Risk III and Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction II scores, length of hospital stay and duration of mechanical ventilation, high vasopressor/inotrope requirement, need for blood and blood products and presence of nosocomial infection,thrombocytopenia, low mean arterial pressure, low hemoglobin value and leukocyte, prothrombin time, high procalcitonin and C-reactive protein values)." **Done**

"-In conclusion part it should avoid to write some words like (we). Instead it is better to write as below: overall the current study showed that.....)" **Done**

"In the disscusion part it is better to avoid mentioning p value. Instead it is better to write down the main findings or conclusion of others studies in a sentence." **Done**

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 1 Aug 2022

farima zakaryaei Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 1 Aug 2022

While the hypothesis is an interesting one and the study is of potential interest to your readers, the main shortcoming of the study is the failure to consider confounding factors.
-The title of the article should be changed. You do not need to mention " A 10-year retrospective study" in the title; it is enough to mention it in the methods.
-Establishing inclusion and exclusion criteria for study participants is standard practice, but these criteria were not mentioned in the methods section of this study.
-In the results section, it has been written that "The mean age of the patients was 6 years (7.4±5.4)", while in table 1 the Mean±SD is 5.4, which is not correct. Which one is correct?
-The exact date and location of the study should be written in the methods section.
In future submissions, I would encourage the authors to consider the format/style of previously published manuscripts.

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 Editor,

Thank you for your and the reviewers' comments about our article *(Evaluation of critically ill paediatric patients in the adult ICU, manuscript ID:121462)***.**

We have read them and answered all the comments one by one below. We made the necessary revision regarding our article.

Best regards.

Comment of Reviewer:

*The title of article should be changed. You do not need to mention the "A 10-year retrospective study" in the title and it is enough to be mentioned in the methods.

We changed the title of article as **"Evaluation of critically ill paediatric patients in the adult ICU".**

*Establishing inclusion and exclusion criteria for study participants is a standard, while were not mentioned in the method part of this study.

We added the inclusion and exclusion citeria for study participants in the methods section of the article.

*In the result part it has been written that "The mean age of the patients was 6 years (7.4±5.4)", while in table 1 the mean±SD is 5.4, which is not correct. Which one is correct?

Actually both are correct and nothing different. Unfortunately, we forgot to write "7.4" in Table 1. We corrected the error and added the mean ratio value in Table 1.

*The exact date of study and the place of the study should be written in the method part.

Both information has been added to the Method section of the article.

*In future submissions, I would encourage the authors to consider the format/style of previously published manuscripts.

We re-checked the article with your Journal' s Instructions for Authors.

Thank you for your unique cooperation.

Sincerely.

Kerem ERKALP, M.D., Prof.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 17 Aug 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Aug 2022

Dear Editor, Thank you for choosing me to review this manuscript again.

The manuscript has been edited based on the comments.

This version of the manuscript can be accepted for publication.