Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 14 · Issue 1 · e132384

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Prevalence of Social Anxiety in Children with Chronic Functional Constipation

Faeze Torabi, Seyed Mojtaba Hashemi, Maryam zamanian, Mehran Shayganfard, Parsa Yousefichaijan

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
18 Oct 2022	21 Dec 2022	27 Dec 2022	10.5812/compreped-132384

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** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Associate Editor 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

4 comments · 24 Oct 2022 – 1 Nov 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 24 Oct 2022

Thank you for your valuable efforts. Please:
1_ Correct the grammar of the manuscript as a whole, with scientific foundations.
2_ Correct the age group distributions by using smaller subgroups.
3_ Complete the discussion section by explaining the reasons for the similarities and differences between the findings of this study and those of other studies.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 30 Oct 2022

COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS:
Abstract:
1. In the methods section, the main outcome measures and statistical methods should be mentioned.
What is meant by age group? Please define it clearly.
2. Date of the study?
Introduction:
3. Sentences unrelated to the aim of the study must be omitted.
4. The introduction should include a better presentation of the main rationale for the study and emphasize the limitations of previous studies (which I did not see).
5. Many studies have been done in this regard. Why did the authors decide to conduct this study again? Which new question do the findings of this study answer? What is the novelty of this study? Please mention these points, point by point.
Methods:
6. Date of the study?
7. The Social Anxiety Scale for Adolescents (SASA) needs a reference.
Results:
8. Table 1 needs a p-value.
9. Tables 1 & 3 must be merged.
Discussion:
10. The limitation and recommendation were not presented. The limitation and recommendation should be mentioned in the last paragraph of the discussion, and any gap, question, hypothesis, or comment should be stated in that paragraph (do not use a separate subheading).
11. Reference no. 13 was incomplete.
Thank you

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 1 Nov 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs major revision.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 1 Nov 2022

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on the comments. Also, you should reply to the comments one by one.

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.

- **Manuscript ID:** 132384
- **Manuscript Title:** The prevalence of social anxiety in children with chronic functional constipation, Arak, Iran

The wanted changes in the manuscript has been highlighted with yellow color and language changes has been highlighted with blue color.

Reviewer 1:
thanks for your valuable efforts. Please
1_ correct grammar of manuscript as whole with scientific foundations.

Thanks for the insightful comment. It was done.
2_correct age group distributions to smaller subgroups

We appreciate the comments. It was added.

3_discussion part should be completed with explaining reasons of similarity and different finding of this study in comparison to other studies.

We appreciate the reviewer's comments. But no study was found which investigating the relationship between social anxiety disorder and constipation in children. There are few studies in this respect but they are in adults not children, that some similarities and differents has been compared.

Reviewer 2:
COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS:
Abstract:
1. In methods section, main outcome measures and statistical methods should be mentioned.

Thanks for the insightful comment. This section was added
What is mean of age group? Pl defines it, clearly.

We appreciate the comments. It was added.

2. Date of study?

We appreciate the comments. It was added.

Introduction:
3. Unrelated sentences to the aim of study must be omitted.

We appreciate the comments. We were going to remove some parts, but with the removal of each part, the correlation and coherence would fall apart. If there is a specific part in the opinion of the respected reviewer, tell them please to remove it.

4. The introduction should include a better representation of the main rational of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies (I did not see).
5. 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? Pl mentions these tips, point to point.

4 &5: We appreciate the reviewer's comments. But no study was found which investigating the relationship between social anxiety disorder and constipation in children. There are few studies in this respect but they are in adults not children.

Methods:
6. Date of study?

We appreciate the comments. It was added.

7. Social Anxiety Scale for Adolescents (SASA) need reference.

Thanks for the insightful comment. It was added.

Results:
8. Table 1 needs p value.

We appreciate the comments. This table is a descriptive one.
9. Tables 1 & 3 must be merged.

The information of age groups was also added to table 3, and because of this matter that table 3 has got p-value column but table 1 hasn't got, they didn't merge with each other.

Discussion:
10. Limitation and recommendation were not seen. 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).

We much appreciate the reviewer's careful review. It was added.

11. Reference no 13 was incomplete.

Thanks for the insightful comment. It was completed.

thank you

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 19 Dec 2022 – 19 Dec 2022

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 Dec 2022

Comments:
1- The units of measurement should be provided throughout the text and abstract, e.g., on line 32, “10-17”, or line 39, “13.43 (1.54)”. Please add “years” and so on.
2- Change “13.43 (1.54)” to “13.43 ± 1.54”.
3- Translate “reference no 11” into English.
thank you

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 19 Dec 2022

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments, not all points have been addressed in the file, and the manuscript still needs revision.

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.

We thank for respected reviewer comments and the wanted changes in the manuscript has been highlighted with pink color.

Reviewer 1:
dear author,
thanks for your efforts and manuscript corrections.
all of indicated parts of manuscript has been corrected but in RESULTS section there is two similar statements that highlighted with RED color. please correct or explain your statements.

Thanks for the insightful comment. This section was corrected. Totally this section speaks about higher prevalence and also severity of social anxiety in girls than boys.

Reviewer 2:
Comments;
1- The unit of measurements should be expressed in whole of text and abstract e.g. line 32 "10-17" or line 39 "13.43 (1.54). pl add "years" and so on .

We appreciate the comments. It was corrected.

2- "13.43 (1.54)" change to "13.43 ± 1.54.

Thanks for the comment. It was done.

3- Translate "reference no 11" to English.

Thanks for the insightful comment. That was corrected.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 23 Dec 2022 – 27 Dec 2022

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT 23 Dec 2022

Comments to the Authors
The authors have addressed all comments by the reviewer.
Thank you.

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 27 Dec 2022

The manuscript has been revised successfully and is suitable for publication.

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 27 Dec 2022

Dear Author,
Thank you for revising the manuscript. It is acceptable for publication and can be published in the next issue.