Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 33 · Issue 5 · e136687

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Cystic Hydatid Disease in Children in Gorgan, North of Iran from 2014 to 2021

Leila Barati, Lobat Shahkar, Amirmohammad Raeiji, Gholamreza Veghari

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 Apr 2023 | 9 Sep 2023 | 15 Sep 2023 | 10.5812/ijp-136687 |

## 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** Rouhallah Mirjani, Associate Editor ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor ..... 4
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 5
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 9

## 1 Original submission

3 comments · 16 Aug 2023 – 28 Aug 2023

**Rouhallah Mirjani** Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 16 Aug 2023

Dear EIC:
This manuscript investigates the prevalence, clinical manifestations, and treatment of hydatidosis in children (3 to 17 y/o) who visited the Taleghani Children's Hospital in Gorgan from 2014 to 2021.
This is a well-written and well-organized article that is very informative about the situation of hydatidosis in the Taleghani Children's Hospital in Gorgan during that period.
The points below could be addressed to improve the manuscript:
1- Although the title refers to the north of Iran, the investigation was done in just one of the Gorgan hospitals (not all provinces of Iran's northern part). So, the title could be changed to refer to Gorgan instead of North of Iran, which would be more precise.
2- There is an article entitled 'Epidemiological and clinical aspects of patients with hydatid cyst in Iran' https://doi.org/10.1007/s12639-016-0803-4. That could be added to the discussion section of the manuscript because, in contrast to the manuscript, it reports a higher prevalence of hydatidosis among female patients than among male patients.
3- The word "admited" is misspelled in the discussion section and must be changed to "admitted".
Best regards

**Rouhallah Mirjani** Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 16 Aug 2023

Dear EIC:
This manuscript investigates the prevalence and clinical manifestation and treatment of hydatidosis in children (3 to 17 y/o) who have visited the Taleghani Children's Hospital in Gorgan from 2014 to 2021.
This is a well-written and well-organized article that is very informative about the situation of hydatidosis in the Taleghani Children's Hospital in Gorgan during that period.
below pointed could be addressed to improve the manuscript:
1- hence the title refers to the north of Iran, the investigation was done just in one of the Gorgan hospitals (not all provinces of Iran's northern part). So, the title could be changed to Gorgan instead of North of Iran which is more précised.
2- there is an article entitled; 'Epidemiological and clinical aspects of patients with hydatid cyst in Iran' https://doi.org/10.1007/s12639-016-0803-4. That could be added to the discussion part of the manuscript because in contrast to the manuscript the prevalence of females with hydatidosis is reported to be more than male patients.
3- the word "admited" is miswritten in the discussion section and must be changed to "admitted".
Best regards

**Associate Editor**

MAJOR REVISION 28 Aug 2023

Dear Authors
Given the reviewers' comments, the manuscript entitled "Cystic hydatid disease in children in north of Iran 2014-2021" needs a major revision. Please revise the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments. You

should also prepare a cover letter to respond to the reviewers' comments or suggestions point by point.
Best 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.

Dear editor,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval.

We hope the revision is acceptable, and I look forward to hearing from you soon. We would like to express our sincere thanks to the editor and reviewers for the constructive and positive comments, and we have revised the paper point-by-point as follows:

Best Regards

*Reviewer 1:*
*Dear EIC:*
*This manuscript investigates the prevalence and clinical manifestation and treatment of hydatidosis in children (3 to 17 y/o) who have visited the Taleghani Children's Hospital in Gorgan from 2014 to 2021.*
*This is a well-written and well-organized article that is very informative about the situation of hydatidosis in the Taleghani Children's Hospital in Gorgan during that period.*
*below pointed could be addressed to improve the manuscript:*
*1- hence the title refers to the north of Iran, the investigation was done just in one of the Gorgan hospitals (not all provinces of Iran's northern part). So, the title could be changed to Gorgan instead of North of Iran which is more précised.*

*Thank you for your valuable comment. It was revised.*

*2- there is an article entitled; 'Epidemiological and clinical aspects of patients with hydatid cyst in Iran' https://doi.org/10.1007/s12639-016-0803-4. That could be added to the discussion part of the manuscript because in contrast to the manuscript the prevalence of females with hydatidosis is reported to be more than male patients.*

*It was added in discussion part.*

*3- the word "admited" is miswritten in the discussion section and must be changed to "admitted".*

*It was corrected.*

*Best regards*
*Reviewer 2:*
*Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled "Cystic hydatid disease in children in north of Iran 2014-2021". The study addresses an important public health issue in the region, as cystic hydatid disease is endemic in Iran. Gathering epidemiological data is valuable for understanding the burden. However, the small sample size and retrospective nature limit the conclusiveness and as a retrospective study, the data is limited to what was contained in the medical records. Important information appears to be missing for some patients. I would recommend this paper for publication after modest revisions to address the limitations further. Expanding the discussion of public health implications would also strengthen the impact.*
*Here is my assessment of the overall quality of this research paper on cystic hydatid*

*disease in children:*
*Introduction:*

*Overall, the introduction provides adequate rationale for the study, but could be strengthened by providing more context and emphasis on the significance of pediatric data specifically in Iran and in this endemic region. Adding a bit more background on clinical aspects would also help.*
*- Update the background with more current epidemiology statistics and sources on Iran and globally.*

*Thank you for your valuable comment. It was updated.*
*- Emphasize why pediatric data is scarce and essential to collect.*

*It was rewritten.*

*- Add information on hydatidosis prevalence in the specific region/province.*

*It was revised.*
*- Briefly summarize common symptoms and cyst characteristics reported in prior pediatric studies.*

*. It was revised.*
*- Consider adding 1-2 clear study objectives or questions at the end.*

*. It was added.*
*Method:*
*- The sample size is relatively small (only 42 cases), which limits the statistical power and generalizability.*

*Thank you so much for your valuable comment but as this study was a cross sectional study during specific time period we had not additional cases and it was one of limitation of our study.*

*- The serology testing rate and positivity rate seem low, suggesting possible issues with testing or documentation.*

*It was discussed in the manuscript.*
*- More information on the surgical procedures performed would add useful clinical details.*

*It was discussed in results and discussion sections according to the data of the documents.*

*Discussion:*
*- Put the main findings into further context by comparing the incidence rate, demographic characteristics, clinical features, and cyst characteristics to prior studies in other endemic regions. This allows readers to better understand how the local epidemiology aligns with or differs from broader trends.*

*It was rewrite.*
*- Elaborate on the public health and clinical implications of the findings. For example, discuss whether the data supports targeted education or prevention campaigns for high-risk groups identified, improved screening recommendations, changes to treatment protocols, etc.*

*It was rewrite.*
*- Discuss the significance of the prevalence in relation to overall pediatric hospital admissions and surgeries. This helps quantify the burden pediatric hydatid disease places on the healthcare system.*

*It was rewrite.*
*- Compare the positivity rates for serology testing and pathology versus other studies to analyze why they seem low. Consider issues like testing methods, population differences, cyst viability, etc.*

*It was revised.*
*- Suggest specific interventions that could help reduce cystic hydatid disease burden based on the local risk factors and transmission patterns observed. This provides actionable outcomes.*

*It was rewrite.*
*- The limitations of the retrospective design and data sources are not sufficiently addressed.*

*Limitation and recommendation were added in the last paragraph.*

*- References are not enough up to date.*

*It was updated.*

---

***Thank you***

## 2 Revision 1

1 comment · 15 Sep 2023

### Associate Editor

ACCEPT 15 Sep 2023

Dear Authors, thank you very much for your effort to correct the article based on the reviewers' comments. However, your manuscript needs editing for grammar and English usage; otherwise, it is acceptable.
Best Regards