OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:

Peer Review

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/compreped.107577
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(3) ; e107577

Peer Review Report for "Pediatric Discharges Against Medical Advice: A Review of Cases in Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria"

Author(s): Adefunke Olarinre Babatola, Oladele Simeon Olatunya, Ezra Olatunde Ogundare, Ayotunde Emmanuel Ajibola, Temitope Olumuyiwa Ojo, Isaac Oludare Oluwayemi, Adebukola Bidemi Ajite, Adewuyi Temidayo Adeniyi, Akinwumi Kolawole Komolafe, Joseph Olusesan Fadare, Oyeku Akibu Oyelami

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	20 Jul 2020
Revised Date:	24 Apr 2021
Accepted Date:	19 Jun 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE : Reviewer

25 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
I received the paper as a reviewer and below the authors can find my concerns that need to be replied to:
Minors:
- I suggest you revise and summarize the introduction part in just 3 paragraphs including background, problem statement, and your study logic.
- In the methods part, please clearly define the study population with inclusion and exclusion criteria. What age range did you exactly consider as pediatric? your results

also include "newborn", "children" and "pediatric", so you have to clearly define these groups in the methods part.
- Who was responsible for data extraction? what was her/his education level? What was his position?
- There are some variables that you have mentioned at the end of the second paragraph of the methods part that I cannot find any values for them in your results; and there are some other variables that have reported values in the tables, but are not listed in the methods part! please revise appropriately and match these variables in both methods and results parts.
There is also one major concern:
- At the end of the last paragraph of results (under the subheading of statistical analysis), you have mentioned that " P-values of <0.05 were accepted as statistically significant. "!!? When there is no comparison, you do not need a p-value.
Despite such a considerable data source, you did not perform any analysis and just report the descriptive statistics. It is an important weak point that needs to be resolved. So, you have to perform more statistical analysis to improve your paper quality. I suggest you perform univariate and multivariate regression logistic analysis, so you can assess the possible role of each mentioned baseline characteristic on making decisions to DAMA in the study population.
All in all, if the authors can properly revise the paper and improve the results, the paper could be suitable for publication.
Kind Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer

25 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable work, investigating the Pediatric Discharges against Medical Advice status in your country. A few comments are suggested to improve the manuscript.
-A few writing problems are detected, most of them misspelling, need to be corrected.
-More new references could be added.
-The tables are not well designed and somewhat confusing particularly in table 2. Please revise them in a more explicit form. Furthermore, abbreviations such as CEW & SCBU should be explained.
-Conclusion should be the last part of the paper, not limitations.
-Finally in my idea this work could be presented as a brief report instead of an original article.
Warm Regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor

30 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs revision. It should be revised based on reviewers comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE : EIC

30 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

The Editor,

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Dear Sir,

RESPONSES TO REVIEW REPORT OF OUR MANUSCRIPT TITLED: **Pediatric Discharges Against Medical Advice: A Seven Year Review of Cases from a Tertiary Healthcare Facility in Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria**.

General Response

We thank you for taking our manuscript through peer review process timely and getting the review comments back to us we are very grateful. Details of our responses to the comments are as provided below. All changes made are highlighted in red color for easy identification. The entire manuscript was checked again for general style and English formatting.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Authors
Comment: I received your paper as a reviewer and below you can find my concerns that need to be replied:
Response: Thank you sir
Minors:
Comment- I suggest you to revise and summarize the introduction part in just 3 paragraphs including background, problem statement, and your study logic.

Response: This has been done. Please kindly see the introduction section

Comment- In methods part, please clearly define the study population with inclusion and exclusion criteria. What age range did you exactly consider as pediatric? your results also include "newborn", "children" and "pediatric", so you have to clearly define these groups in methods part.

Response: These have been done. Please, kindly see Page 6 Lines 10 - 22

Comment- Who was responsible for data extraction? what was her/his education level? What was his position?

Response: The medical record officers retrieved the case notes manually and resident doctors in the units extracted all relevant information from the case notes. Please kindly see Page 6 Lines 15 -17

Comment- There are some variables that you have mentioned at the end of second paragraph of methods part that I cannot find any values for them in your results; and there are some other variables that have reported values in the tables, but are not listed in methods part! please revise appropriately and match these variables in both methods and results parts.

Response: These have been reconciled in order to improve the readability

Comment: There is also one major concern:
At the end of last paragraph of results (under subheading of statistical analysis), you have mentioned that " P-values of <0.05 was accepted as statistically significant. "!!? When there is no comparison, you do not need p-value.
Despite of such a considerable data source, you did not perform any analysis and just report the descriptive statistics. It is an important weak point that needs to be resolved. So, you have to perform more statistical analysis to improve your paper quality. I suggest you to perform univariate and multivariate regression logistic analysis, so you can assess the possible role of each mentioned baseline characteristics on making decision to DAMA in study population.

Response: These have been performed. Please, kindly see the Analysis section under the methods Page 7 Lines 3-8 and Page 9 Lines 3 -6 of the results section. A new table, Table 3, has been introduced. The few cases with complete information at the SCBU could not support inferential analysis.

Comment: All in all, if you can properly revise the paper and improve the results, the paper could be suitable for publication.
Kind Regards

Response: Many thanks. Our best regards

Reviewer 2:
Dear authors, Thanks for your valuable work, investigating the Pediatric Discharges against Medical Advice status in your country. A few comments are suggested to improve the manuscript.
Comment-A few writing problems are detected, most of them misspelling, needs to be corrected.
-More new references could be added.

Response: The entire manuscript has been formatted and checked for readability. In addition, we cited as many as possible relevant local and international literature. Nevertheless, we would be grateful if any particular omission that might be useful is/are pointed out

Comment-The tables are not well designed and somewhat confusing particularly table 2. Please revise them in a more explicit form. Furthermore, abbreviations such as CEW & SCBU should be explained.

Response: The tables have been further formatted for easy readability. The old Table 2 has been removed. We introduced a new Table 3 on inferential statistics.

-Conclusion should be the last part of the paper, not limitations.

Response: This has been implemented

Comment-Finally in my idea this work could be presented as a brief report instead of an original article.
Warm Regards

Response: Many thanks, however, we belief the content and concept of the manuscript is sufficient enough for an original paper. Our best regards.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Alireza Baratloo : Reviewer — 19 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I received these revisions and despite resolving minor points, the major point is still present. I clearly want you to perform uni-variate and then multi-variate logistic regression to assess the possible role of each assessed variable including age, Religion, Parents' marital status, Tribe/Ethnicity, Social Class, Health insurance, Clinical diagnosis.
Please perform the required analysis and add the results to the current one so it could be acceptable.
Kind Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 4 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable work, many questions have been answered but not all of them. Following are my comments:
- The keywords should be revised.
- Some parts of the manuscript is not fluent yet, for example: “where children aged between aged greater than one month to 17 years are admitted and the Special Care Baby Unit (SCBU) where children aged ≤ 1 month are admitted”
- Please note the registered ethical code of the study
- The manuscript has not been revised according to updated references. The work in 2021, only one reference from 2019 and the others are older.
- From the conclusion section, it is not understood that what percentage of the hospitalized cases was affected by DAMA
Best Regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 4 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE : EIC — 4 Feb 2021

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

The Editor,

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Dear Sir,

RESPONSES TO REVIEW REPORT OF OUR MANUSCRIPT TITLED: **Pediatric Discharges Against Medical Advice: A Seven Year Review of Cases from a Tertiary Healthcare Facility in Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria**.

General Response

We thank you for taking our manuscript through peer review process timely and getting the review comments back to us we are very grateful.

However, the corresponding author was indisposed for over 3weeks and just finished recuperating from isolation and treatment hence, the delay in responding to the comments. We the authors are very interested in publishing our manuscript with your reputable journal and will therefore be very grateful if our manuscript is given expedited/fast-tracked processing in view of the time loss due to circumstances beyond the authors` control.

Details of our responses to the comments are as provided below. All changes made are highlighted in red color for easy identification. The entire manuscript was checked again for general style and English formatting.

Thank you

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Authors

Comment: I received your revisions and despite of resolving minor points, the major point is still present. I clearly want you to perform uni-variate and then multi-variate logistic regression to assess the possible role of each assessed variables including age, Religion, Parents marital status, Tribe/Ethnicity, Social Class, Health insurance, Clinical diagnosis.

Please perform the required analysis and add the results to current one so it could be acceptable.

Kind Regards

Response: We thank you for your comments. We have conducted the said inferential analysis and found further findings which have been incorporated. However, the nature of the data could not permit logistic regression as we did not compare DAMA data with those from patients without DAMA since we did not collect full data on the later group because we only noted the frequency as this was not the focus of the study. Hence, we performed further inferential statistics as applicable to the data. A new Table (Table 4 has been generated following this further analysis)

Reviewer 2:

Dear authors thanks for your valuable work, many questions have been answered but not all of them. Following are my comments:

Response: We Thank you

Comment: The keywords should be revised.

Response: This has been done

Comment: Some parts of the manuscript is not fluent yet, for example: "where children aged between aged greater than one month to 17 years are admitted and the Special Care Baby Unit (SCBU) where children aged ≤ 1 month are admitted"

Response: This has been corrected. Please kindly see lines 10-13, Page 6

Comment: Please note the registered ethical code of the study

Response: This has been done

Comment: The manuscript has not been revised according to updated references. The work in 2021, only one reference from 2019 and the others are older.

Response: This has been done. Please kindly see refs 17, 26, 27,32, & 38

Comment: From the conclusion section, it is not understood that what percentage of the hospitalized cases was affected by DAMA

Response: This has been done. Please, kindly see the conclusion

Thank you

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 5 May 2021

Dear AE
I received the authors' reply, and I'm aware of the limitations for performing further analysis. The paper in current format is acceptable.
Kind regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 8 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
In my opinion, the respected authors have performed all the required .changes and have revised the manuscript successfully.
Regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 19 Jun 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE : EIC — 19 Jun 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.