Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 35 · Issue 3 · e158045

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigation of Serum Electrolyte Imbalances in Neonates Undergoing Cardiac Surgery

Serife Ozalp, Zinet Aslanci, Senay Coban, Selin Saglam, Ezgi Direnc Yucel, Incila Ali Kahraman, Hatice Dilek Ozcanoglu, Erkut Öztürk, Funda Gumus Ozcan, Alican Hatemi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
18 Nov 2024	1 Feb 2025	18 Feb 2025	10.5812/ijpediatr-158045

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** Mohammad Reza Zarkesh, Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor 3

Authors' reply to reviewers 4

Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

4 comments · 15 Jan 2025 – 22 Jan 2025

Mohammad Reza Zarkesh Reviewer

REJECT 15 Jan 2025

Dear Authors
Thank you very much for your efforts in conducting this research and writing this manuscript. I reviewed it, and although it is a good manuscript, it has no new message and no novelty, so I cannot recommend this paper for publication in an international journal. My final decision on this manuscript is: Rejection

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 19 Jan 2025

The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not clarified.
The follow-up schedule is not clear regarding the timing and intervals of electrolyte measurements or the measurement method.
There is no statement about confounding factors and the possibility of bias.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 22 Jan 2025

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review your interesting manuscript. Below are some points that need clarification to improve your manuscript.
The ethics approval code must be written.
You should provide more details about the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
The timing of laboratory tests was not explained.
Other morbidities like seizure and IVH must be explained, especially after hyponatremia and hypernatremia.
Limitations were not discussed.
Confounding factors were not explained.
Write the conclusion more briefly.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 22 Jan 2025

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to this journal.
The reviewers' comments can be found below for your consideration.
Please edit your study based on the reviewers' comments.

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 the opportunity to submit a revised version of our paper. We also want to thank the reviewers for their valuable contributions. In this revised version, we tried to include all reviewer's ideas to improve the paper. Please see below a summary of the changes made.

Reviewer 1:

no public comment

Answer: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Authors

Thank you very much for your efforts in this research and writing this manuscript, I reviewed it although it is a good manuscript but it has no new message and no novelty so I cannot recommend this paper for publication in an international journal and my final decision on this manuscript is: Rejection

Answer: Thank you very much for your valuable contribution. We appreciate your time and effort in reviewing our manuscript.

Reviewer 3:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review your interesting manuscript. Below are some points that need clarification to improve your manuscript

1. Ethics approval code must be written.

Answer: Our ethics committee approval number is stated at the end of the methodology section.

2. You should explain more details about inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Answer: We have revised the methods section to provide more detailed explanations regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria and we have added a template related to this in the methodology section.

3. Time of checking lab tests was not explained.

Answer: We have now specified the timing of laboratory tests in the methods section to ensure clarity.

4. Other morbidities like seizure and IVH must be explained, especially after hypo- and hypernatremia.

Answer: We have now discussed the presence of seizure as potential morbidities associated with hypo- and hypernatremia in the results and discussion sections.

5. Limitations were not discussed.

Answer: We have now added a limitations section to acknowledge the study's constraints and potential sources of bias.

6. Confounding factors were not explained.

Answer: We have added a statement about confounding factors in the limitations section of the manuscript.

7. Write the conclusion more briefly.

Answer: The conclusion has been revised for conciseness while maintaining the key takeaways of the study.

Reviewer 4:

1. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not clarified.

Answer: We have revised the methods section to provide more detailed explanations regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria and we have added a template related to this in the methodology section.

2. The follow-up schedule is not clear according to time, interval, and method of electrolyte measurements.

Answer: We have revised the manuscript to clarify the follow-up schedule, including the timing, intervals, and methods of electrolyte measurements.

3. There is no statement about confounding factors and the possibility of bias.

Answer: We have added a statement about confounding factors in the limitations section of the manuscript.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript in this journal.

Comments of reviewers can be found below for your consideration .

Please edit your study based on the reviewers' comments.

Answer: We appreciate the opportunity to improve our manuscript based on the reviewers' insightful feedback. We have carefully addressed all comments and made the necessary revisions to enhance the clarity, methodology, and overall quality of the study.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

EIC Decision:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr. Four reviewers and an Associate Editor have now reviewed your manuscript. I now have the Referees' reports, which suggest that your manuscript might be suitable for publication following some revisions. I have attached some reviewer comments and invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript addressing the points made.

Answer: Thank you very much for your valuable contribution.

Reviewer Comments in the Attached File

1.What method was used to measure electrolytes? Was the method of measuring electrolytes the same before, after and during the operation? Were the measurements taken during the operation with a blood gas analyzer?

Answer: The method of electrolyte measurement was the same before, during, and after the operation. A blood gas analyzer was used in all cases

2- Phosphorus was mentioned at the abstract and measure section, but there was no phosphorus in the results

Answer: You are right about this. Although we initially included phosphorus when planning the study, we did not use it due to significant missing data during the study. Thank you very much for your attention. We have also removed it from the abstract and measure sections.

3- In the method section, it was mentioned about the neonatal outcomes of seizures, but it was not mentioned about seizure in the results section.

Answer: Necessary additions regarding seizures have been included in the results section of the manuscript and one table (Table 3) has also been created.

4-The inclusion criteria was not discussed in abstract.

Answer: The inclusion criteria have been added to the abstract section.

Serife Ozalp, MD,

On behalf of co authors

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 14 Feb 2025 – 16 Feb 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 14 Feb 2025

Thanks for the details you added to your manuscript.

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT 16 Feb 2025

Thank you for making the necessary changes and for your explanation.

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 16 Feb 2025

Thank you for the changes made to your manuscript based on the reviewers' comments. Your manuscript has been accepted for publication.