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-122885
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 13(2) ; e122885

Peer Review Report for "Epidemiology of Diseases and Mortality in a Pediatric Intensive Care Unit in Qazvin, Iran"

Author(s): Zahra Pirzadeh, Mehri Jamshidi, Banafsheh Arad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	25 Jan 2022
Revised Date:	9 May 2022
Accepted Date:	13 May 2022

Revision (0)

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

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.

Answer to Reviewer 1:

Abstract:
1- Methods section was incomplete.

Answer: The method section of the abstract was corrected according to your comment.

2- Results section, some of findings were inconsistent such as “41 of them (65.1%)!!! were male.” (Table 1: total 106: 55 females, 41 male)!!! PLS were under two years old (17/23, 74%).!!!! (Table 1: > 28 days, 13 (22%))!!!! And so on. Pl re-checks the findings and corrects them.

Answer: The result section and the Tables are re-checked.

Introduction:
3- This section was lecture note. Introduction is so weak and need revision, totally.

The introduction section was completely rewritten and relevant references were used.

Answer:

4- The rationale of the study should be explained in a more detailed way in the last paragraph of the introduction section. Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? What was novelty of this study?

Answer: The reason for the study was written in more detail at the end of the introduction according to your comment. The cause of death and the risk factors had not been done so far in Qazvin province.

Methods:
5- How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula? Explain it.

In this study, we reviewed the records of all children admitted to the PICU for five consecutive years. We did not miss any data. In cases where some information was not included in a record, we removed it from the analysis. The above explanation was mentioned in the method section, according to your comment.

Answer:

6- What was sampling methods?

Answer: In the five years studied, all patient records were included in the study.

7- 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).

Answer: The inclusion and exclusion criteria mentioned in the first paragraph of Method section according to your comment.

8- How many subjects were assessed for eligibility? And then how many subjects were allocated?

Answer: All eligible individuals were evaluated during the study period, and documented variables were extracted.

9- Did you Lost to follow-up?

Answer: Considering that the study was retrospective, there was no loss to follow-up.

Results:
10- Results part should be re-organized. The current format is difficult to follow.

Answer: The result section revised and reorganized according to your comment.

11- Results section, some of findings were inconsistent in text and table, such as “41 of them (65.1%)!!! were male.” (Table 1: total 106: 55 females, 41 male)!!! PLS were under two years old (17/23, 74%).!!!! (Table 1: > 28 days, 13 (22%)) but in table 2, PLS was 23!!!! Total died children in table 2 was 104!!! In text was 106, And so on. Pl re-checks the findings and corrects them.

Answer: Results and findings corrected according to your comment.

Discussion:
12- You said: “Most of the patients in this study were boys” but in table 1, 55girls and 41 boys!!!; and other aforementioned mistake. Therefore, discussion should be revised according to changed finding.

Answer: Discussion was rewritten according to the correction of the results.

13- The authors said: “sepsis was the main causes of death”. It is suggested that “Sepsis” should be expressed in more detail and one or more sentences must be noted about this issue. For example, you note: [the 3th cause of die in infants is sepsis. Various organs infections can be the origin of sepsis and contaminated umbilical cord is one of the sources of sepsis in infancy. Bacterial colonization is seen in un-hygiene cord especially in underdeveloped country that may be lead to cellulitis, omphalitis and eventually sepsis.] You should be mentioned to these valuable and new articles in your references: [1- Bathing or Not Bathing: Which Is Better for

Umbilical Cord Separation Time and Bacterial Colonization in Neonates? Arch Pediatr Infect Dis. 2021 9(2): e104100. doi: 10.5812/pedinfect.104100.]

Answer: We mentioned the importance of sepsis by reference in the introduction section.

Conclusion:
14- This section needs revision, totally. Conclusion should be expressed based on finding, only. Also, the recommendation should be mentioned in the last paragraph of discussion.

Answer: We revised the conclusion section and expressed the recommendations in accordance with the findings.

Answer to Reviewer 2:
The whole article is very useful and efficient. Some English spelling changes are required.

Answer: Thank you for your attention. We have modified the English spelling according to your comment.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)