Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 33 · Issue 1 · e128852

OPEN PEER REVIEW

A Retrospective Single-center Study of Presentation and Prognosis of Guillain-Barré Syndrome in Pediatric Patients

Mohammad Mehdi Nasehi, Pooria Ahmadi, Zahra Khalili, Maryam Rahmannia, Zahra Ahmadi, Mahmoud Reza Zinatzadeh, Elham Pourbakhtyaran

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
9 Jun 2022	10 Dec 2022	16 Dec 2022	10.5812/ijp-128852

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** Mirjana Zdraljevic 2
2 **Revision 1** Mirjana Zdraljevic 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

1 comment · 28 Aug 2022

Mirjana Zdraljevic Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 28 Aug 2022

I am honored to have the opportunity to review “Retrospective single-center study of presentation and prognosis of Guillain-Barré syndrome in pediatric patients”. This work includes a significant number of patients, and the conclusions themselves contribute to current scientific knowledge. The authors found fewer autonomic dysfunctions and cranial neuropathies and a smaller percentage of AIDPs in their GBS cohort compared with previously published results. However, similar to previously published results, they found that the axonal form of GBS is a predictor of unfavorable prognosis in GBS patients. However, I have a few comments, questions, and suggestions:

Introduction

1. GBS is not only a post-infectious immune-mediated disease, but other triggers of this immune-mediated disease have been described so far. Please correct this in the introduction.
2. “GBS is reportedly the most frequent flaccid paralysis after the advent of polio vaccine.” — Unnecessary and confusing. Please explain or delete it from the introduction.
3. There are two additional forms of GBS: pharyngobrachial and pure paraparetic forms.
4. "Just observation alone" is not a treatment option; you should emphasize symptomatic treatment.
5. “Despite various efforts and treatments, reportedly around 20% of cases, GBS complications lead to death or severe disability” — please specify the difference between severe disability and mortality.

Method

1. State how the diagnosis of GBS was made and according to which criteria.
2. You should state what signs of dysautonomia were investigated and collected.
3. You should state what signs of cranial neuropathy were investigated and collected.
4. You did not mention electrophysiological studies in the method section, and this is a very important part of your research. Please explain the criteria that you used and into which groups patients were classified according to electrophysiological criteria.
5. Please insert the part regarding the statistical method.

Results

1. What does it mean that patients had an incomplete recovery? Also, in the Method section, state how you monitored the patients' progress/recovery. Have you used the GBS Disability Scale or any other standardized measurement?

In my opinion, the discussion is good, but the above suggestions should be implemented in order to consider the publication of the paper.

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 associate editor, we thank you very much for the comments and suggestions. The comments and suggestions are valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. We have made revisions according to the reviewers' comments and suggestions, as described in the authors' response.

Reviewer 1:

Introduction
1. GBS is not only a post-infectious immune-mediated disease but other triggers of this immune-mediated disease have been described so far. Please, correct this in the introduction: corrected
2. GBS is reportedly the most frequent flaccid paralysis after the advent of polio vaccine. - unnecessary and confusing. Please explain or delete it from the introduction: deleted
3. There are two additional forms of GBS: pharyngobrachial and pure paraparetic form: added
4. "Just observation alone" is not a treatment option, you should emphasize symptomatic treatment: highlighted
5. Despite various efforts and treatments, reportedly around 20% of cases, GBS complications lead to death or severe disability- please specify the difference between severe disability and mortality.corrected
Method
1. State how the diagnosis of GBS was made, and according to which criteria. corrected
2. You should state what signs of dysautonomia were investigated and collected. corrected
3. You should state what signs of cranial neuropathy were investigated and collected. corrected
4. You did not mention electrophysiological studies in the method section, and this is a very important part of your research. Please explain the criteria that you used and in which groups patients were classified according to electrophysiological criteria.Added
5. Please, insert the part regarding the statistical method. Added
Results
1. What does it mean that patients had an incomplete recovery? Also in the Method section, state how you monitored the patients' progress/recovery. Have you used the GBS Disability Scale or any other standardized measurement? We wrote residual symptoms instead of incomplete remission. We used GBS Disability Scale for evaluation.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 25 Sep 2022

Mirjana Zdraljevic Reviewer

REJECT 25 Sep 2022

Even after the corrections based on the previous comments, there are still major concerns related predominantly to the methodology of the work.
1. The authors did not specify which criteria were used to diagnose GBS. The mere statement that clinical and paraclinical criteria were used means nothing.
2. They again did not state what signs of dysautonomia were investigated and collected. They only listed these signs in the results, but these signs must also be stated in the methodology.
3. Also, they did not state what signs of cranial neuropathy were investigated and collected.
4. They did mention electrophysiological studies in the method section, but did not explain which criteria they used and into which groups patients were classified according to electrophysiological criteria.
5. They wrote that the GBS disability scale was used to assess the residual deficit, but in the part where the residual deficits are counted, they are not rated at all according to the specified scale.

In my opinion, this paper does not meet the criteria for publication.

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.

Reviewer 1:

1. The authors did not specify according to which criteria the diagnosis of GBS was made. The mere statement that clinical and paraclinical criteria were used means nothing. Corrected

2. They again did not state what signs of dysautonomia were investigated and collected. They only listed these signs in the results, but the aforementioned must also be stated in the methodology.Added

3. Also they did not state what signs of cranial neuropathy were investigated and collected.Added

4. They did mention electrophysiological studies in the method section, but did not explain the criteria which they used and in which groups patients were classified according to electrophysiological criteria. added

5. They wrote that the GBS disability scale was used to assess the residual deficit, but in the part where the residual deficits are counted, they are not qualified at all according to the specified scale. corrected

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.