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.116602
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(4) ; e116602

Peer Review Report for "Predicting Successful Extubation Rate Using Modified Spontaneous Breathing Trial in PICUs"

Author(s): Nagwa Mohamed Sabry Mahmoud

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	14 Jun 2021
Revised Date:	9 Oct 2021
Accepted Date:	16 Oct 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

3 Aug 2021

1. The number of words in the abstract is large. It should be less.
2. The results section is written very briefly in the abstract. Reduce the number of words in the other parts of the abstract and add them to the results.
3. Keywords do not match the MeSh.
4. You should emphasize the importance of her research in the introduction by citing more and more authoritative references.
5. The ethics of the research should be clearly stated and, if available, the code of ethics and where it was obtained.
6. The tables are not of the required quality.
7. A more reasoned discussion is expected in the discussion section, referring to similar studies and their differences and commonalities.

REFEREE : Reviewer

2 Sep 2021

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:
The manuscript needs totally revision and paraphrases (English grammars).
Citing references should be notice according to the journal rules "(...)."
The authors has repeatedly stated the place and country in the text (object, ...) pl mention it only in methods section only once. Not in others section.

Title:
Title was so long. Any abbreviation and also place are not required (STB and Minia University Hospital, Egypt).
Abstract:
We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time in text: PICU, STB and so on.
Word count limit should be considered. Background was too long.
In objects section, omit the place.
In methods section was seen repetitive sentences (place,....). The authors should be explained the STB methods, briefly but precisely.

Background:
Background was too long. Need revision, totally. Remove unrelated content to title and aims of research, such as some part of first paragraph and so on.
The background should summarize the purpose and the rationale for the study. It should neither review the subject extensively nor contains data or conclusions of the study. What was the clinical statement of study?

Discussion:
This section needs revision. It must be concentrated on the new and important aspects of the study and the achieve conclusions. Discussion should emphasize on the present findings and the variations or similarities with other related studies.
The first paragraph and second paragraph were not suitable for this section (omit or move to introduction section).
In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first paragraph and then allude to other studies. The discussion part should be in an organized way; justify the possible reason for the consistency/ inconsistency of the results of the present study and previously published study.

References:
References did not arrange according to the rules of the journal.
Most of them were so old. The most of references were too old (before 2010, almost before 2005). There have been only a few references from 2010. References need renewal.
Thank you

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

• *The number of words in the abstract is large. It should be less.*	• *number of words in the abstract was reduced words*
• *The results section is written very briefly in the abstract. Reduce the number of words in the other parts of the abstract and add them to the results.*	• *Done*
• *Keywords do not match the MeSh.*	• *Corrected*
• *You should emphasize the importance of her research in the introduction by citing more and more authoritative references.*	• *Done* • *More updated references where added*
• *The ethics of the research should be clearly stated and, if available, the code of ethics and where it was obtained.*	This study was approved by the ethical committee, faculty of medicine, Minia University, Egypt *This mentioned in the methodology section*
• *The tables are not of the required quality.*	• *Modification was done*
• *A more reasoned discussion is expected in the discussion section, referring to similar studies and their differences and commonalities.*	• done

Reviewer 2:

• *The manuscript needs totally revision and paraphrases (English grammars).*	• According to the valuable reviewer's advice, the manuscript was sent to a professional language editor

	and correction was done
• *Citing references should be notice according to the journal rules "(…)."*	• *References were arrange according to the rules of the journal.*
• *The authors has repeatedly stated the place and country in the text (object, …) pl mention it only in methods section only once. Not in others section.*	• *Corrected*
• *Title:* *Title was so long. Any abbreviation and also place are not required (STB and Minia University Hospital, Egypt).*	• *Title was modified as requested*
Abstract: *We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time in text: PICU, STB and so on.* *Word count limit should be considered.* *Background was too long.* *In objects section, omit the place.* *In methods section was seen repetitive sentences (place,….). The authors should be explained the STB methods, briefly but precisely.*	• *Correction was done*
• *Background:* *Background was too long. Need revision, totally. Remove unrelated content to title and aims of research, such as some part of first paragraph and so on.* *The background should summarize the purpose and the rationale for the study. It should neither review the subject extensively nor contains data or conclusions of the study. What was the clinical statement of study?*	• *Correction was done*
• *Discussion:* *This section needs revision. It must be concentrated on the new and important aspects of the study and the achieve*	• *Done*

conclusions. Discussion should emphasize on the present findings and the variations or similarities with other related studies. *The first paragraph and second paragraph were not suitable for this section (omit or move to introduction section).* *In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first paragraph and then allude to other studies.* • *The discussion part should be in an organized way; justify the possible reason for the consistency/ inconsistency of the results of the present study and previously published study.*	
• *References:* *References did not arrange according to the rules of the journal.* • • *Most of them were so old. The most of references were too old (before 2010, almost before 2005). There have been only a few references from 2010. References need renewal.*	• • *References were arrange according to the rules of the journal.* • *More updated references where added*

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

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.

.

Reviewer 2:

Abstract:

1-We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time in text: MV	Corrected
2- Methods section need revision, totally. “On the PICU at Minia University Hospital. From January 2019 to June 2020, we screened 150 critically ill infants aged 30 days to 18 years…..” need paraphrases.	*Done*
3- what was design of study?	*A prospective cross sectional study*
4-Methods section in this type manuscripts is very important and in fact the main and key part of article. With considering the words limitations of abstract section, the authors should be explained the STB methods, briefly but precisely and clearly.	*Corrected*

Introduction:

5-Background was too long. One or two paragraph is enough. Remove unrelated content to title and aims of research, such as some part of last paragraph and so on.	*Modified as requested*
6-I ask you the critical question: 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?	*This study was conducted in minia city ,Egypt which consider one of the very limited resources city in Egypt , we want shows our experience in improving the outcome of mechanically ventilated children admitted to our PICU*
7-Objects of study should be noted precise and clearly (in last paragraph)	*Added*

Methods:

8- What was sampling methods?	Cohort sampling
9- How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula did you use?	***Necessary sample size = (Z-score)2 * standard deviation * (1 - standard deviation) / (margin of error)2*** *This was done by statistical specialist.*
10- Eligible and allocated participants were noted in text (with number, briefly and clear). Finally, the number of subjects analyzed in each group should be stated. How many subjects were assessed for eligibility? And then how many subjects were allocated? Did you Lost to follow up?	Done
11-Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be mention to first paragraph then after, eligible and allocated participants were noted (with number, exact and clearly).	Done

Results:

12- The first paragraph was repetitive and no suitable for this section (this was mentioned in methods section). Pl deletes it.	*Done*

Discussion:

13- The first paragraph was not suitable for this section and omit it especially line 1-12 and so on.	*Deleted as requested*
14- You note “This study included 150 critically ill children who were mechanically ventilated and extubated to noninvasive ventilation in our PICU, from January 2019 to June 2020”. This repetitive and must be deleted. This was not suitable for this section.	*Deleted as requested*
15- I see yours limitation and recommendation but it suggested that this comment should be declared. The authors should be noted: “According to the PMV side effects, the best way to prevent delay or early disconnection of MV and misdiagnosis or over use in these subjects is to use guidelines. The use of guidelines in many cases of medical challenges is very helpful, e.g in preventing the overuse of antibiotics, medical modalities and facilitating diagnosis and management of the difficult medical situations such as presented issue (PMV)”. You should be mention to this new and valuable 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”.	*Modified as requested*
16- The discussion part must be in an organized way; in the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first paragraph and then	Done

allude to other studies. Justify the possible reason for the consistency/ inconsistency of the results of the present study and previously published study. It must be concentrated on the new and important aspects of the study and the achieve conclusions. Discussion should emphasize on the present findings and the variations or similarities with other related studies.	

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

1-Objects of study should be noted precise and clearly (in last paragraph). (Highlighted paragraph should be moved to the end of introduction section).	***Done***
2- What was a cohort sampling method? It seems that sampling method was convenience and simple. Pl notices it in the text.	***Corrected***
3- How did you calculate the sample size? Pl fills the your sample size formula aand includes it in the text.	***Done***
4- Methods section must be in an organized way. Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be mention to first paragraph then after, eligible and allocated participants were noted (with number, exact and clearly).	***Inclusions and exclusions criteria were added***
5- The discussion part must be in an organized way; in the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first paragraph and then allude to other studies.	***Done***
6- Reference no 37 was incomplete. Authors name and title of article?! [Siroosbakht S, Aarabi N, Rezakhaniha B. 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]. pl correct and complete it, precisely.	***Done***

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)