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-129463
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 13(4) ; e129463

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Umbilical Cord Thickness and Its Association with Antenatal Maternal Risk Factors: A Cross Sectional Prospective Study"

Author(s): Jaiprakash Narayan, Deepali Bangalia, Laxman Singh Charan, Satyendr Sonkariya, dinesh kumar barolia, Pukhraj Garg

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	5 Jul 2022
Revised Date:	29 Aug 2022
Accepted Date:	31 Oct 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

7 Jul 2022

Comments for authors:
1- It needs English editing, totally.
2- There is no standardization for some words throughout the introduction. Citing references should be notice according to the journal rules “(...).”Citing references should be noted at the end of sentences ....”(..).” and also, “(table ...).”
Abstract:
3- It need English editing and paraphrases, totally.
4- Where was the study place?

Introduction:

5- This section was so week. Need revision, totally.

The introduction should include a better representation of the main rationale of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies. It should neither review the subject extensively nor contains data or conclusions of the study (one or two paragraph is enough).

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? 6-What is novelty of this study?

Methods:

7- Study design was questionable and justify. It seems that it was cross sectional not cohort.

8- What were antenatal maternal risk factors? Pl explains it.

9- What is sampling methods?

10- How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula did you use?

11- Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete. Pl defines precisely and clearly.

12- What no assessed for eligibility? And then what no was allocated? Did you Lost to follow-up?

13- Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be mention to first paragraph then after, eligible and allocated participants were noted (with number, exact and clearly).

14- You said “>34 weeks and birth weight>1250 grams!!! And also Mean gestational age at delivery was significantly lower in mother with antenatal risk factor as compared to those without antenatal risk factors (37±2.1 wk versus 38.14±1.64 wk; p=0.01). This included neonates with IUGR, low birth weight and normal neonates. Bias in patients’ selection was clear.

15- There are many confounding factors in the studies about in children with CKD (for example anomalies of subject,BMI, obesity, associated diseases of mothers such PB, diabetics, nutritional status of mothers, and many others confounders. How did you include the confounding factors in the results? Clearly define all potential confounders and effect modifiers. Describe statistical methods to control of these factors.

16- Several methodological mistakes further hamper the overall quality of the manuscript and the authors should be considered checklist (STROBE) in order to improve their manuscript.

Results:

17- Mean umbilical cord diameters in both groups were near at all. The finding of differences was not justified.

Discussion:

18- This section was so weak and need revision, totally.

19- Many sentences in this section were repetitive (it has noticed in background) and not suitable in this section.

20- 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. Discussion should emphasize on the present findings and the variations or similarities with other related studies.

21- 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 (not utilize separate subheading).

References:

22- Numbers of references were so low and “not enough” for literature review.

23- Most of them were so old. The most of references were too old (before 2014, almost before 2010). There have been only a few references from 2010. References need renewal.

Thank you

REFEREE : Reviewer

10 Jul 2022

I appreciate the opportunity of considering me in this review process.

These points need further revision before proceeding to next steps.

1. The abstract needs complete revision; It is prepared in non attractive way.
2. The method of study is written briefly; including, excluding criteria, the brand of tool, the performer and risk factors need more explanation.
3. in abstract part they mention "That is the reason behind this study" What does it mean?4
4. The Native English revision is necessary in this file

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 – Reply

Reviewer 1:
Comments for authors:
1- It needs English editing, totally.

Reply – done

2- There is no standardization for some words throughout the introduction. Citing references should be notice according to the journal rules "(…)."Citing references should be noted at the end of sentences …."(..)." and also, "(table …)."
Abstract:

Reply – done
3- It need English editing and paraphrases, totally.

Reply – done by Nedmedica editing system

4- Where was the study place?
Introduction:

Reply – mentioned in manuscript, Rajkiya Mahila Chikitsalaya, J L N Medical College, Ajmer, India

5- This section was so week. Need revision, totally.
The introduction should include a better representation of the main rationale of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies. It should neither review the subject extensively nor contains data or conclusions of the study (one or two paragraph is enough). 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?

Reply – revised as per instruction

6-What is novelty of this study?
Methods:

Reply – this is a cross sectional prospective study with statistical analysis resulting significant results.

7- Study design was questionable and justify. It seems that it was cross sectional not cohort.

Reply - this is a cross sectional prospective study

8- What were antenatal maternal risk factors? Pl explains it.

Reply – mention in manuscript

9- What is sampling methods?

Reply – random sampling

10- How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula did you use?

Reply – no sample size calculation

11- Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete. Pl defines precisely and clearly.

Reply – mention it

12- What no assessed for eligibility? And then what no was allocated? Did you Lost to follow-up?

Reply – follow-up and table related to follow-up mentioned

13- Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be mention to first paragraph then after, eligible and allocated participants were noted (with number, exact and clearly).

Reply – done

14- You said “>34 weeks and birth weight>1250 grams!!! And also Mean gestational age at delivery was significantly lower in mother with antenatal risk factor as compared to those without antenatal risk factors (37±2.1 wk versus 38.14±1.64 wk; p=0.01). This included

neonates with IUGR, low birth weight and normal neonates. Bias in patients' selection was clear.

Reply – clearly excluded bias factors in patient selection

15- There are many confounding factors in the studies about in children with CKD (for example anomalies of subject,BMI, obesity, associated diseases of mothers such PB, diabetics, nutritional status of mothers, and many others confounders. How did you include the confounding factors in the results? Clearly define all potential confounders and effect modifiers. Describe statistical methods to control of these factors.

Reply – diabetics, nutritional status of mothers (anaemia) included in this study

16- Several methodological mistakes further hamper the overall quality of the manuscript and the authors should be considered checklist (STROBE) in order to improve their manuscript.

Reply – improved as per STROBE
Results:

17- Mean umbilical cord diameters in both groups were near at all. The finding of differences was not justified.

Reply – statistical analysis explained this

Discussion:
18- This section was so weak and need revision, totally.

Reply – revised as per instructions

19- Many sentences in this section were repetitive (it has noticed in background) and not suitable in this section

Reply - revised
20- 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. Discussion should emphasize on the present findings and the variations or similarities with other related studies.

Reply – done

21- 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 (not utilize separate subheading).

Reply – done

References:
22- Numbers of references were so low and “not enough” for literature review.

Reply – increased

23- Most of them were so old. The most of references were too old (before 2014, almost before 2010). There have been only a few references from 2010. References need renewal.

Reply – done

Reviewer 2:
1. The abstract needs complete revision; It is prepared in non attractive way.

Reply – done

2. The method of study is written briefly; including, excluding criteria, the brand of tool, the performer and risk factors need more explanation.

Reply – done

3. in abstract part they mention "That is the reason behind this study" What does it mean? 4

Reply – corrected

4. The Native English revision is necessary in this file

Reply – done

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.

Abstract:
It needs revision, totally.
1- Line 5-6 belongs to method not introduction. Pl insert in accurate section.

Ans. Done
2- Line 6-10 were repetitive (purpose, aim,..!!) pl corrects it.

Ans. Deleted
3- Method was incomplete.

Ans. Done

Introduction:
4- In first paragraph, line 38, it is suggested that "umbilical cord and sepsis" should be expressed in more detail and one or more sentences must be noted about this issue. For example you note: [sepsis is the main causes of death in infants (the third cause of die). Various infections can be the origin of sepsis and infected umbilical cord is one of the sources of sepsis that can lead to cellulitis, omphalitis and eventually sepsis.] Authors should be mentioned to this valuable and new article in your references: [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.]

Ans. Done

Aim:
It was good and clear.

Methods:
5- This section was not organized, need revision (pl see the STROBE Check list).

Ans. Done
6- Line 60 was repetitive, pl omit it.

Ans deleted

7- Line 66, gestation period and newborn birth weight of control group must be expressed.

Ans. Done

8- If an apparatus or diagnostic lab test is used, its manufacturer's name and address should be given in parenthesis.

Ans. Mentioned it in manuscript

9- What is sampling methods? It seems that was convenience and simple, not random (if the research design is cross sectional).

Ans. There is no such study was done in india. so, we collected the sample as our convenience and simple

10- Author said: “no sample size calculation”. This is not acceptable. How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula did you use? The calculation of samples with academic formula is important and can be shown the power of study. Expression of “σ=?,ß=?, α=? and d= ? “ are important for generalization of finding. Explain it.

Ans. No formula used as sample collected the sample as our convenience and simple

Results:
It was clear.
11- The number of figure and table should be reduced (max limit 3-5 figure and table, according to journal rules)

Ans. Both graph and table 5 removed.

Discussion:
This section was revised and it was good.

References:
12- According to journal rules, references arrange by Vancouver style, not APA or AMA.

Ans. Done
13- The most of references were too old (before 2014, almost before 2010). References need renewal, yet.

Ans. No recent study was found related to my article, so, it is our compulsion to keep old references

.
Thank you

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Reviewer

19 Aug 2022

I appreciate that you send me this review process.
There are some points in this manuscript:
The discussion section is written in a nonprofessional way; It is non organized and does not follow a logical format.
It is not routine in citation or mentioning an article to write the first name of author: "Morteza Tahmasebi et al did their study..." [line 124]
The references does not follow a unique format of writing
The study size is not clarified
The English writing needs total revision

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. The discussion section is written in a nonprofessional way; It is non organized and does not follow a logical format.

Ans – discussion is done in chronological order.

2. It is not routine in citation or mentioning an article to write the first name of author: "Morteza Tahmasebi et al did their study..." [line 124].

Ans. Correction done

3. The references does not follow a unique format of writing

Ans. Done

4. The study size is not clarified

Ans. **Study size** - we collect the sample as our convenience and simple.

5. The English writing needs total revision

Ans. English writing revision done by Nedmedica, as per instruction of journal guideline. Certificate attached.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 30 Sep 2022

Dear EIC
The requested and mentioned points were totally revised by authors. Now it is suitable for publication.

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 31 Oct 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.

Mohammad Reza Boloursaz : EIC — 31 Oct 2022

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