Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 35 · Issue 1 · e148367

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Children with Familial Mediterranean Fever in South-Eastern Region of Türkiye

Alper Dogan, Ayse Balat, Beltinge Demircioglu Kilic, Mehtap Akbalık Kara, Mithat Buyukcelik

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
7 May 2024	12 Aug 2024	1 Sep 2024	10.5812/ijp-148367

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

1 Original submission

1 comment · 7 Jun 2024

Farhad Salehzadeh Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 7 Jun 2024

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled:

Evaluation of Children with Familial Mediterranean Fever in Türkiye

This is a pediatric case series study from the southern part of Türkiye, with genotype-phenotype correlation analysis and discussion.

Türkiye is a country with the largest share of FMF and other AID involvement, and discussions of these diseases always yield new findings.
In my opinion, this manuscript is worth publishing; however, it needs some revision:

1. The migration of the disease should be changed to migration of people.
2. FMF in the southeast region of Türkiye: The southeast region should be mentioned in the title instead of Türkiye alone.
3. Criteria suggested by Yalçınkaya: I think a short explanation of these regional criteria is necessary.
4. Change big joints to Large joints.
5. Table 3: sedimentation should be changed to: Erythrocytes sedimentation rate (ESR).
6. The authors should tell us about these E148Q mutations in their normal populations. In our experience, this is a variant found in nearly 23 percent of the normal population without any significant findings.
7. I did not see information about the dosage of colchicine in these patients.
8. The report of no colchicine resistance was impressive. Although the authors made some points, additional reasons such as:

geography, ethnicity, and incomplete reporting… may play a role in some way.

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 Dr. Vahid Ziaee

Subject: Submission of Revised Manuscript [Manuscript ID: 148367]

I am reaching out to inform you that the revisions you requested for our manuscript, titled " **Evaluation of Children with Familial Mediterranean Fever in South-eastern Region of Türkiye** ", have been fully addressed and incorporated. Based on the feedback provided by the reviewers and editorial team, I have taken the required measures to thoughtfully address and integrate their comments and suggestions. Moreover, a complete proofreading has been carried out to ensure better readability.

From my perspective, I strongly believe that the changes made have greatly enhanced the overall quality of our manuscript. Attached to this letter, you will find:

1. A revised version of the manuscript.
2. A detailed response to reviewers' comments, outlining how each comment has been addressed.

It is my sincere hope that the revised manuscript has been successfully revised to meet the high standards and expectations of IJ Pediatrics. I am looking forward to receiving your favorable consideration and feedback.

I am grateful for the time and effort you invested in managing our manuscript. Feel free to reach out to me if you need more information or clarification.

Sincerely,

Detailed Response to Reviewers' Comments

Reviewer #2:

1. **Comment:** The migration of the disease should be change to migration of people.
   Response: The migration of individuals is highlighted in the revised sentence, as suggested by the reviewer.
2. **Comment:** FMF in the southeast region of Türkiye: Southest region should be mentioned in title instead of Turkiye alone
   Response: The title has been revised as advised by the reviewer.
3. **Comment:** Criteria suggested by Yalçınkaya: I think a short explanation about this regional criteria is necessary.
   Response: As per the suggestion, additional background information has been included.
4. **Comment:** Big joints change to Large joints.
   Response: The term has been revised as advised by the reviewer.
5. **Comment:** Sedimentation should be changed to: Erythrocytes sedimentation rate (ESR)
   Response: The table has been revised as advised by the reviewer.
6. **Comment:** Authors should tell us about this E148Q mutations among their normal populations. In our experience this is a variants in near 23 percent of normal population without any significant findings.
   Response: Analysis results about E148Q has been incorporated, as suggested by the reviewer.
7. **Comment:** I did not see about the dosage of colchicine in these patients.
   Response: We have included the dosage information for colchicine in the manuscript.
8. **Comment:** Nil report about colchicine resistance was impressive, although authors had some points more reasons such as: geographic, ethnicity, incomplete reporting…. May have a role in some way.
   Response: No additional action was carried out.

Reviewer #3:

1. **Comment:** The introduction could be improved by providing more background information on the pathogenesis of FMF, the role of the MEFV gene and pyrin protein, and the clinical significance of studying FMF in the pediatric population.
   Response: The introduction has provided an overview of the MEFV gene's role in FMF and has delved into the pathogenesis, emphasizing the significance of pyrin. For easier reading, subheadings have been included. The clinical significance of studying FMF in the pediatric population has been described, as suggested by the reviewer.
2. **Comment:** The specific criteria used for the clinical diagnosis of FMF, apart from mentioning the criteria suggested by Yalçınkaya et al.
   Response: Additional details have been provided for the criteria used in the study.

3. **Comment:** The methods used for genetic testing and mutation analysis.
   Response: Additional details have been provided regarding the methods and procedures utilized in genetic testing.
4. **Comment:** Any potential sources of bias or limitations in the retrospective data collection process.
   Response: The explanation of biases and limitations in study design has been provided. Furthermore, details on addressing missing data have been incorporated into both the bias section and the statistical analysis section.
5. **Comment:** 5. One potential weak point in the results section is the lack of clear organization and subheadings. The results are presented in a continuous narrative format, which can make it difficult for the reader to follow and identify the key findings. Introducing subheadings for different aspects of the results, such as clinical manifestations, genetic mutations, laboratory findings, and treatment responses, could improve readability and clarity.
   Response: Following the reviewer's suggestion, subheadings were added to enhance the readability.
6. **Comment:** Additional statistical analyses, such as multivariate analyses, could be performed to further explore the relationships between genetic mutations and clinical manifestations while accounting for potential confounding factors.
   Response: A preliminary correlation analysis was conducted to identify potential associations between clinical manifestations, genetic mutations, and resistance to colchicine. Further evaluation has been conducted on significant and biologically plausible parameters through the application of both univariate and multivariate logistic regression. The study results and subsequent discussion have been updated accordingly.
7. **Comment:** Provide a more structured and focused discussion, with separate sections or paragraphs dedicated to the interpretation of specific findings, such as the genotype-phenotype correlations, the role of the E148Q mutation, and the treatment responses.
   Response: Following the reviewer's suggestion, subheadings were added to enhance the readability.
8. **Comment:** Compare and contrast their findings with a broader range of relevant literature, not just studies from Türkiye.
   Response: In our effort to address this issue, we sought new references and conducted a comprehensive analysis, incorporating evidence from different parts of the world. The discussion section has been revised in accordance with the suggestions of the reviewer.
9. **Comment:** Discuss the potential implications of their findings for clinical practice, such as the importance of early diagnosis, genetic testing, and appropriate treatment strategies based on mutation types.
   Response: Further discussions have been included to address the clinical significance of our findings.

10. **Comment:** The authors could consider including a limitations section to acknowledge potential limitations of the study, such as the retrospective nature of the data collection, any potential biases, and potential sources of bias or confounding factors
    Response: As suggested, a discussion of the limitation has been included.
11. **Comment:** The references used in the article appear to be generally relevant and appropriate for the topic. However, some of the references are quite dated, with several citations from the early 2000s. It would be beneficial to include more recent references, particularly in the introduction and discussion sections, to ensure that the latest developments and research in the field are adequately represented.
    Response: We have thoroughly revised our literature review and updated nearly all our referenced articles. All references earlier than 2015 have been eliminated, apart from a few that are considered important for the discussion.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 30 Aug 2024

Farhad Salehzadeh Reviewer

ACCEPT 30 Aug 2024

I reviewed the original version of this manuscript before reviewing the revised copy, but I am not sure whether it was for this journal or another one.
Although it does not contain new messages or add new information to our previous knowledge, it appears to be an interesting repetition of previous work.