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-121420
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 13(2) ; e121420

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of Video Education on Mothers' Knowledge of Hazard Factors and First Aid Administration in Choking Incidents"

Author(s): Nasrin Sarabi, Mahnaz Nosratabadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	25 Nov 2021
Revised Date:	23 Mar 2022
Accepted Date:	5 Apr 2022

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

31 Dec 2021

Dear EIC
This is a good work and suitable for publication if the authors have passed the validity, stability and consistency process in preparing their questionnaire before this study.

I recommend them to cite the article or study they performed in preparing the Persian questionnaire they have used in this study.

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,
Thank you for your valuable comments
Corrections were made based on your comments in the text.
Thanks

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thank you for presenting this manuscript. But I have many questions (21 questions) about this presentation:
Abstract:
1-"Available" sampling change to "convenience". **Line 14**
2- Study design was controversial. It seems that was observational-analytic study. **Line 13**
3- Frequency and frequency percent of finding before and after should be mentioned, precisely. The main finding must be noticed, clearly. **Line 19 to 29.**

Introduction:
This section was good.
4- I ask you the critical question: Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? What is novelty of this study? Which new question does the findings of this study answer? **Last paragraph . line 75-82.**
Methods:
5- Need revision, totally. It study seem that "observational- analytic study. Date and place should be noted precisely. ***Line 88-90***
6- Delete Line 4-6 in first paragraph and move to the limitation part in the end of discussion. ***In line 239-244.***

7- How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula? Explain it. **In line 98-102.**
8- "Failure to complete or incomplete completion of the questionnaires…." It was loss to follow up or missing data not exclusion criteria. **In line 98-102.**
9- Eligibility and enrollment were differing from exclusion and inclusion criteria. Exclusion and inclusion criteria were incomplete. Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be mention to first paragraph then after, eligible and allocated participants were noted (with number, exact and clearly). **In line 93-97.**
10-Eligible and allocated participants were noted in text (with number, briefly and clear). Finally, the number of subjects analyzed should be stated. **In line 93-97.**
How many subjects were assessed for eligibility? And then how many subjects were allocated? Did you Lost to follow-up? **In line 93-97.**
11- Number of each group was not clear. Two groups should be explained clearly. Pl expressed precisely. **In line 93-97.**

Results:
12- Needs revision, totally. The main finding should be explained in the results section. **In line 141-167.**
13- On the base of finding, it seems that all subjects allocated in questionnaire interventions (one group), but in methods section authors noted two groups!! **L In line 141-167.**

14- If design study is quasi-experimental, it is suggested that in the first, for each items data analysis must be done and then after total analysis express (table 3 & 4). But if observational- analytic study, it is

understandable. **In line 141-167.**
15- Legends' of tables 3 and 4 should be changed. **In table was changed.**
16- The specific role of video presentation did not show. **In line 141-167. In table was changed.**

Discussion:
17- This section needs revision, totally. In fact there was no comprehensive discussion. In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first paragraph and then allude to other studies. **In line 177-180, 211-227, 232-237.**

Justify the possible reason for the consistency/ inconsistency of the results of the present study and previously published study. **In line 177-180, 211-227, 232-237.**
*The discussion part should be in an organized way; It must be concentrated on the new and important aspects of the study and the achieve conclusions***. Totally changed.**
*18- 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***.in line 239-244.**
In last paragraph, it is better to comment the clinical statement of this study; it suggested that this comment should be declared. The authors should be noted: [According to the importance and standardization of choking handling in children, the best way to create proper and best way for education and also proper use of maneuvers in this issue is to use guidelines and public bulletins. In emergent medical situations, the guidelines and public bulletins are very practical for parents and first aid caregivers to prevent delayed and the proper use of maneuvers, medical modalities and management of the difficult medical situations such as prescribing antibiotics and also presented issue (choking in children)]. You should be mentioned 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]. **in line 232-237.**

In all parts of the discussion, important issues were discussed.

Conclusion:
*19- Needs revision, totally." in the control group and intervention group" ?!!! there was not control group this study.***in line 246-251.**

References:
*20- Ref no 15 was incomplete. Pl corrects it***. Was chnged. In line 239-242.**
21- More than 50% of them were so old. The most of references were too old (almost before 2013, 16 references). There have been only a few new references. References need renewal. **Revised totally. 1,2,5,14,15,16,17 was changed.**

Several methodological mistakes further hamper the overall quality of the manuscript, especially study design and the authors may consider reviewing checklist in order to improve their manuscript. Authors should be saw the same article and STROBE check list in this regards (qualitative research) and consult with a statistics methodologist. ***The study is not observational and the*** *STROBE* ***checklist is not usable. The study is quasi-experimental and tried to use a CONSORT checklist to check the***

quality of the article.

Best regards

Reviewer 2:
Dear EIC
This is a good work and suitable for publication if the authors have passed the validity, stability and consistency process in preparing their questionnaire before this study.

I recommend them to cite the article or study they performed in preparing the Persian questionnaire they have used in this study. **In line 111-114. The questionnaires were not Iranian**

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.

Dear reviewers,
Thank you for your valuable comments
Corrections were made based on your comments in the text.
Thanks

Reviewer 1:
comments for authors:
Thank you for presenting this manuscript. I totally appreciate the efforts that have been done by the authors in conducting this interesting study. This manuscript can be useful for future scientific studies on Effectiveness of video education on mothers' knowledge of hazard factors and first aid administration in choking incidents.
All points mentioned have been changed by authors. The manuscript is now acceptable and printable.

Thanks

Reviewer 2:
Subject
1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? Yes
2) Does the article have novelty? No, line 82-89
Title
3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? Yes
4) Is there any abbreviation in the Title? No line

Abstract
5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes
6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? Yes
Introduction
7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) Yes
8) Does Introduction include: “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”? No, line 52-79. All background was changed.
Materials And Methods
9) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)? Yes
10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? Yes
11) Adequacy of the sample studied? Yes
12) Subjects Representative of Target Population? No, line 258-262. This was the main limitation of our study.

13) Provided sample size calculation or justification? No, line 108-115
14) Control Subjects Appropriate? Yes
15) Power of study declared? No
16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes
17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)? No, we could not did that.
18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)? No, line 105-107
19) Identify the methods apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)? Yes
20) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?
21) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?-
22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? Yes
23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? No, line 156.
Results
24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? Yes
25) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? Yes
26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables?-
27) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample."?-
Discussion
28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? Yes
29) Analysis supports Conclusion? Yes
References
30) Proper Writing of the References? Yes
31) References for the last five years? Yes
Dear EIC
Thank you for presenting this manuscript. I have this final comment: The validity and reliability of the questionnaires that were used in this study should be checked in a separate study before current study. Line 128-130 and line 134-135. In study that we use the one of questionnaire (reference 10) the reliability and validity of the questionnaire was not mentioned so we did that for our study. Another questionnaire is a guideline and made by researcher but we did validity and reliability for that(reference 11).

> Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript still needs revision.

> EIC Decision:

Dear Author Please revise the manuscript based on all comments of reviewers. Also please state an Ethical Approval Code with a direct link. Read more Here

Writing the ethical approval code is mandatory in all Original articles on people, medical records, and human or animal samples.
This code must be linked to a webpage showing the details of approval.
Examples:
Wrong: (because it is not linked to a webpage)
"This study is approved under the ethical approval code of .... IC-23456 ...."
Correct:
"This study is approved under the ethical approval code of .... IC-23456 (webpage of ethical approval code is: http://www.URL.com/IC-23456) ...." line 284-290.
Do NOT Write:
This study was approved by our ethical committee.
We accepted all rights of Helsinki protocol in our study.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)