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 "**Open 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:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/compreped.114476
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(4); e114476

Peer Review Report for "Reasons for Requesting a CT Scan and Amount of Radiation Exposure in Hospitalized Children, the Issue Needs Attention"

Author(s): Alireza Kiani, Leila Barati, MohammadHadi Gharib, Mohammadali Vakili, Farshid Kompani, Azaleh Khajavi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 9 Mar 2021
Revised Date: 27 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 30 Aug 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 | Revision (0)

19 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1) Please rephrase the words.
2) Dear author you should write the reason for referring each individual for CT. This kind of writing is not acceptable.
3) What happened to the other 63 scans?
4) This conclusion could not be acceptable. You designed this study in order to give guidelines. Now it is passing to pediatrics.
5) That is quite clear. Everybody knows that. By your attractive title reader imagine getting such information but unfortunately could not.
6) It is expected that in this section you give more information about the previous studies associated with the amount of safe dose in children in relation to different diseases.
7) What about Iran dear author? Is that any information available in this particular correlation?
8) Dear author the reader in the conclusion section would be waiting for the intervention planning program.
9) Dear author this study even could be performed based in a retrospective manner.

10) Dear author please do not use repeated words in one sentence.
11) Dear author for comparisons of groups what have you done in your analysis of data.
12) Dear author 18 is the child? Please draw the frequency of age within 280 cases.
13) Again repeating. What happened to the rest of CT.
14) Did you review 118 out of 280? What happened to the others?
15) It is supposed that in this study you should write the amount of radiation in all patients.
16) Dear author, please be accurate. 344 or 343 or 280.
17) Dear author how could you compare your result that belongs only to one hospital to other countries.
18) Rewrite, please.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
I thank the authors for all their efforts to publish scientific manuscripts to expand the public knowledge.
I think this manuscript advances health care worldwide by sharing knowledge and expertise to improve experiences, outcome and value. I totally appreciate the efforts that have been done by the authors in conducting this interesting study. But I have many questions about this presentation:
Abstract:
- Objects were revised according to title of study. The objects of study should be declared precisely and clear and measurable.
- Method was incomplete. What do you want to measure?
- Beginning of sentences with numbers is not correct: 45%....and 151 scan....
- The conclusion should be focused and clear.
Introduction:
- We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: CT
- There is no standardization for some words throughout the text (for example: ".(reference)" should be change to "(reference)."
- Because of high frequency of brain CT, The authors briefly explain the consequence of radiation and long complication this issue. For example you note: "high dose of radiation in the brain, may be influence pituitary function in the future especially children under 2 years old. This issue lead to main complications such as decreased growth hormone, thyroid and sex hormones, resulting in reduced growth, fertility problems and even micropenis in boys". You should be mentioned these new and valuable references in background and/or discussion section: "1- Which of the Anthropometric Parameters and Hormonal Variables in Prepubertal Children Are Correlated to True Micropenis?, Iran J Pediatr. 2021; 31(1):e108534. doi: 10.5812/ijp.108534. And 2- Is It Necessary to Weight Loss in Obese Boys with Small Penile Length? A Case-Control Study, J Compr Ped. 2020 ; 11(4):e107272. doi: 10.5812/compreped.107272."
- Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? Which new question does the findings of this study answer? What is novelty of this study? Pl mentions these tips, point to point.
Methods:

- Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete. PI defines precisely and clearly.
- Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be mention to first paragraph then after, eligibility and allocated participants were noted (with number, exact and clearly)

Results:

- Beginning of sentences with numbers is not correct: 26 cases and so on
- This section should be summarized (the results that shown in the tables do not need to be repeated in the text). the main finding such as normal CT frequency should be stated in text.

Discussion:

- Discussion section was so week. In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first and then allude to other studies. It concentrates on the new and important aspects of the study and the achieve conclusions. The differences and advantages of this study should be compared and mentioned with other studies.
- Considering the above cases of normal CT scan results, the author should mention similar cases of excessive use such as over use of antibiotics in children. For example the authors note: “Excessive use is seen in children in various subjects such as inappropriate use of antibiotics, radiology modalities such as CT and so on. In addition, physicians should be known that the overuse of these modalities not only increases the treatment cost, but also it is unethical. According to the side effects of these modalities, the best way to prevent misuse or overuse in these subjects is to use guidelines and reviewing the need to use CT scans and similar items”. You should be mention to this article in your references: “A Survey of Pediatricians’ Views and Practices Regarding Parents’ Request for Prescribing Antibiotics: A Qualitative Study. Arch Pediatr Infect Dis. 2019 July; 7(3):e91217. doi: 10.5812/pedinfect.91217”.
- Limitation and recommendation should be mentioned in the last paragraph of discussion and in last paragraph any gap, question, hypothesis or comment should be declared (conclusion).

Conclusion:

- The conclusion should be focused and clear.

References:

- References did not arrange according to the rules of the journal. Only 9 references were cited and also, the most of them were so old.
- References 2, 3, 5 and 6 were one book and repetitive. PI sees the rule of journal about insertion of text book reference.

Thank you

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Jul 2021

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 19 Jul 2021

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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.

Dear reviewers,

I thank you for your valuable comments; I used your scientific comments to improve the quality level of the article. It is mentioned with underline.

Sincerely

Leila Barati

Dear Reviewer 1:
1) Please rephrase the words.

It is rephrased.
2) Dear author you should write the reason for referring each individual for CT. This kind of writing is not acceptable.

The reasons for referring are added.
3) What happened to other 63 scans?

280 patients had done 344 CT scans. Out of 280 patients, 222 patients underwent scan from one, 55 patients from two and 4 patients from three different anatomical locations, so we had 344 CT scans of 288 patients.
4) This conclusion could not be acceptable. You designed this study in order to give guideline. Now it is passing to pediatric.

The conclusion is corrected.
5) That is quite clear. Everybody knows that. By your attractive title reader imagine to get such information but unfortunately could not.

The conclusion is corrected.
6) It is expected that in this section you give more information about the previous studies associated with the amount of safe dose in children in relation to different disease.

It is rewritten.
7) What about Iran dear author? Is that any information available in this particular correlation?

Unfortunately I haven't found any relative information about Iran.
8) Dear author the reader in conclusion section would be wait for intervention planning program.

The conclusion is corrected.
9) Dear author this study even could be performed based on retrospective manner.

It is corrected.
10) Dear author please do not use from repeated words in one sentence.

It is corrected
11) Dear author for comparisons of groups what have you done in your analysis of data.

In this descriptive study we had not compared between groups.
12) Dear author 18 is child? Please draw the frequency of age within 280 cases.

Yes, in our children hospital up to 18 years is admitted so we had their documents for analysis.

I have mentioned the frequency of age in text.
13) Again repeating. What happened to the rest CT.

280 patients had done 344 CT scans. Out of 280 patients, 222 patients underwent scan from one, 55 patients from two and 4 patients from three different anatomical locations, so we had analyzed 344 CT scans.
14) Did you review 118 out of 280? What happened to the others?

'Out of 155 brain scans 115 were normal' is correct.
15) It is supposed that in this study you should write the amount of radiation in all patients.

It is written and added in text.
16) Dear author, please be accurate. 344 or 343 or 280.

280 patients had done 344 CT scans. Out of 280 patients, 222 patients underwent scan from one, 55 patients from two and 4 patients from three different anatomical locations, so we had analyzed 344 CT scans.

17) Dear author how could you compare your result that belongs only to one hospital to other countries.

Although we couldn't compare our results with other countries, but we did it because we didn't have any relative survey in other hospital for comparison.

18) Rewrite please.

It is corrected.

Dear Reviewer 2:

Abstract:

Objects were revised according to title of study. The objects of study should be declared precisely and clear and measurable.

It is revised.
Method was incomplete. What do you want to measure?

It is revised.
Beginning of sentences with number is not correct: 45%....and 151 scan….

It is corrected.
The conclusion should be focused and clear.

It is rewritten.
Introduction:
We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: CT

It is mentioned in the first line of background of abstract.
There is no standardization for some words throughout the text (for example: ". (reference)" should be change to "(reference)."

It is corrected.
Because of high frequency of brain CT, The authors briefly explain the consequence of radiation and long complication this issue.
Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? Which new question does the findings of this study answer? What is novelty of this study? Pl mentions these tips, point to point.

It is mentioned in the introduction.

Methods:
Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete. Pl defines precisely and clearly. Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be mention to first paragraph then after, eligibility and allocated participants were noted (with number, exact and clearly)

It is rewritten.

Results:
Beginning of sentences with number is not correct: 26 cases and so on.

It is corrected
This section should be summarized (the results that shown in the tables do not need to be repeated in the text). the main finding such as normal CT frequency should be stated in text.
It is rewritten.
Discussion:

It is rewritten.

Limitation and recommendation should be mentioned in the last paragraph of discussion and in last paragraph any gap, question, hypothesis or comment should be declared

It is added.

Conclusion:

The conclusion should be focused and clear.

It is rewritten.

References:

References did not arrange according to the rules of the journal. Only 9 references were cited and also, the most of them were so old.

References 2, 3, 5 and 6 were one book and repetitive. Pl sees the rule of journal about insertion of text book reference.

It is revised

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 18 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
Comments to the Author:
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there are rooms for further improvement which the authors should consider. The following points are of concern and minor suggestions are marked in the following. Several important recommendations were suggested, especially in the introduction and discussion sections, but no precise answer was given. PI sees the previous recommendations in previous review (revision 0) and adds valuable mention references.
1- In the introduction section, because of high frequency of brain CT, The authors briefly explain the consequence of radiation and long complication this issue other than cancer.
2- The discussion part should be re-organized. The current format is difficult to follow.
The clinical significance of the study findings was still inadequately discussed. “Considering the above cases of normal CT scan results, the author should mention similar cases of excessive use such as overuse of antibiotics in children and suggest the best way to prevent misuse or overuse in these subjects is providing guidelines and reviewing the need to use CT scans and similar items”.
Presenting the last word on the issues and summarizing thoughts and conveying the larger implications of the study, demonstrating the importance of ideas, and introducing possible new or expanded ways of thinking about the research problem. One well-developed paragraph is sufficient for a conclusion.
Thank you

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 Aug 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Aug 2021

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor 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.

Dear reviewers,

I thank you for your valuable comments; I used your scientific comments to improve the quality level of the article. It is mentioned with underline.

Sincerely

Leila Barati

Comments to the Author:

1-In introduction section, because of high frequency of brain CT, The authors briefly explain the consequence of radiation and long complication this issue other than cancer.

It is mentioned.

2- The discussion part should be re-organized. The current format is difficult to follow.
The clinical significance of the study findings was still inadequately discussed. “Considering the above cases of normal CT scan results, the author should mention similar cases of excessive use such as over use of antibiotics in children and suggest the best way to prevent misuse or overuse in these subjects is providing guidelines and reviewing the need to use CT scans and similar items”.
Presenting the last word on the issues and summarizing thoughts and conveying the larger implications of the study, demonstrating the importance of ideas, and introducing possible new or expanded ways of thinking about the research problem. One well-developed paragraph is sufficient for a conclusion.

It is revised.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 30 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for authors:
I reviewed the manuscript, again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. All points mentioned have been changed by authors.
I totally appreciate the efforts that have been done by the authors in conducting this interesting case. I think this manuscript advances health care worldwide by sharing knowledge and expertise to improve experiences, outcomes,s, and value.
thank you

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 30 Aug 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 30 Aug 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.