Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 14 · Issue 1 · e126319

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Prevalence of Developmental Delay in 12-month-old Infants, Urban Health Centers, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, 2018 - 2019

Nasrin Ezatpanah, Masoome Nikoo, Shahnam Arshi, Narges Gholami, Latif Gachkar

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
11 Apr 2022	7 Nov 2022	12 Nov 2022	10.5812/compreped-126319

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission 2
2 Revision 1 Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 Revision 2 Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

> Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
It is not clear at all that the authors seek to resolve which research questions in the field! The writings have nothing to do with this. In other hand, it seems that the authors of the article did not even know the structure of the articles in the journal and it seems that the writers of the journal did not pay attention to the “Author Guide”. The authors have merely given the descriptive information. This article, in fact, has no new findings; no new knowledge has been generated and there is no any contribution to knowledge.

Dear reviewer,

Thank you very much to the respected reviewers whose valuables comments help us to improve our article.

We tried answer your questions. The structure of the article changed according the journal.

Although there is some same previous paper about developmental delay in pediatrics in different area, this article is proper for Iranian pediatricians, family physicians and ministry of health. Most of the cross-sectional studies just report the epidemiology of the events and these data are able to considered as a helpful health or diagnostic programs in future.

Reviewer2:
Comments for authors
I totally appreciate the efforts that have been done by the authors in conducting this interesting subject but I have many questions about this presentation:
1- We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: DD and so on, in abstract and text.
Done.

Abstract:
2- The overall prevalence of Child Suspected to DD and Children with DD must be expressed.

Done and highlighted.

3- The conclusion must be expressed according to real and preformed analysis.

Done.

Background:
4- Introduction and discussion sections were so week. This section needs revision. The introduction should include a better representation of the main rationale of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies. The limitations of previous studies had not been insufficiently discussed.

Although there is some same previous paper about developmental delay in pediatrics in different area, this article is proper for Iranian pediatricians, family physicians and ministry of health. Most of the cross-sectional studies just report the epidemiology of the events and these data are able to considered as a helpful health or diagnostic programs in future.

5- Pl explains clinical statement of this report and also novelty of study should be expressed in more detail.

Although there is some same previous paper about developmental delay in pediatrics in different area, this article is proper for Iranian pediatricians, family physicians and ministry of health. Most of the cross-sectional studies just report the epidemiology of the events and these data are able to considered as a helpful health or diagnostic programs in future.

Methods:
6- What was sampling methods?

It explains in method part.
7- How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula? Explain it. The power of study was not clear.

It explains in method part.

8- Exclusion and inclusion criteria were not defined correctly and 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).

Done.

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

Out of 27,450 of 12-month-old infants who referred to these centers from 23rd August 2018-23rd August 2019, ASQ form had been completed by parents, 5025 questionnaires based on their file numbers and using random number generation software at www.random.org were randomly selected. Questionnaires which were not filled completely by parents were excluded.

10- Did you Lost to follow-up?

It is retrospective study.

11- All terms should be defined precisely

Done.
12- COREQ: Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research: a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups
Results:
13- The overall prevalence of Child Suspected to DD and Children with DD must be expressed.

Done.
Discussion:
14- Line 1-2 belongs to methods section. pl mention it in methods part.
15- This section needs revision, totally. It was so week. At first, 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 mention with other studied. Also mini-review of article must be done and compared this presentation with others and novelty of study express in more detail, but unfortunately it was not seen accordingly.
16- Each significant finding must be discussed and explained.
17- Limitation and recommendation should be mentioned in the last paragraph of discussion.

Done.
18- In recommendation part, it is suggested to express the using of guidelines in this issue. For example, the authors note: [several modalities are utilized to assess general health status of children. In addition, delay in diagnosis of DD, not only increases the morbidity of children, also it is unethical. The using guidelines and general child health approvals are a way to early diagnosis of DD. The guidelines can help pediatrics and health workers to manage it, timely and properly, as had been performed in the antibiotic utilizing in infectious diseases by guidelines and general child health approvals]. You should be mentioned to this valuable and new 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.]
Conclusion:
19- The main finding and differences must be expressed and mentioned. The conclusion must be expressed according to real and preformed analysis.

Done and highlighted.

thank you

sincerely,

by corresponding author

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 17 Sep 2022

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 17 Sep 2022

Dear EIC
The manuscript still needs revision. The authors should satisfy the reviewer and reply to the comments completely.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor,

Thanks for your valuable comments. Authors answered the reviewers' comments and highlighted lines.

Reviewers' Comments:

Q: Method section was not organized.

A: Authors edited it and highlighted. Flow chart 1(Case selection) added.

Q: exclusion and inclusion criteria.

A: Done.

Q: sample size?

A: sample size and method section edited and Flow chart 1(Case selection) added.

Q: Overall prevalence of child suspected to DD and DD?

A: Done.

Q: References (11-12-20)?

A: Done.

Sincerely,

Corresponding author,

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 10 Nov 2022 – 12 Nov 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 10 Nov 2022

Comments to the Author
The authors have addressed most comments by the reviewers.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 12 Nov 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been revised successfully.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 12 Nov 2022

Dear Author,
Thank you for your efforts in revising the manuscript. It is acceptable now.