Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 14 · Issue 4 · e133658

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Prevalence of Low Birth Weight in Children with Nephrotic Syndrome

Simin Sadeghi-Bojd, Elham Zarifi, Motahare Alisofi, Saeedeh Sarhadi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
24 Jan 2023	13 May 2023	14 Jun 2023	10.5812/compreped-133658

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, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 9
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 13

1 Original submission

3 comments · 2 Feb 2023 – 17 Mar 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Feb 2023

comments for authors:
in children jcp
1- It is a cross-sectional study; therefore, “effect” or “causing” was not defined by this study design. Please delete “effect” from the title and main text throughout the manuscript. You could report only the prevalence data and risk ratio (association).
2- We are not allowed to use any abbreviation without defining it at first use: SRNS, LBW, etc.
Abstract:
3- The Results section is not correct. You said, “In the steroid-responsive subgroup, low birth weight was significantly higher than in the steroid responsive group.”
4- Furthermore, if this was a cross-sectional study, it evaluated the condition in question at a single point in time. These studies can generate prevalence data for a condition, not correlations or causation, because there are many confounding factors in studies involving children.
Please add prevalence data for low birth weight in the steroid-responsive and steroid-resistant groups.

Introduction:
5- This was very long. It seems like lecture notes. Sentences unrelated to the aim of the study must be omitted.
6- The introduction should include a better representation of the main rationale of the study and emphasize the limitations of previous studies. However, I did not see these.
I ask you this critical question: Many studies have been done in this regard. Why did the authors decide to conduct this study again? Please explain this in more detail.
6- What does this presentation add to readers’ existing, established scientific knowledge?

7- Line 43: What was INS?! Also, FSGN was written twice.
Methods:
8- This format of the Methods section was not justified and was difficult to follow. It needs complete revision.
9- Please see the STROBE checklist.
10- What was the study design? Please state it.
11- What were the sampling methods?
12- How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula did you use?
13- You said 90% of subjects were steroid-responsive, but in the Results section, 162 children were steroid-sensitive (SS) and 97 were steroid-resistant (SR). Please explain this precisely and clearly.
14- The numbers of eligible participants and those finally enrolled in each group should be stated precisely and clearly.
Results:
15- Lines 92-94 (statistical methods) must be moved to the Methods section.
16- Lines 97-98 (“When compared to the steroid-invulnerable group, the steroid-sensitive group had a birth weight of 3.0 0.54 versus 2.77 0.66; p = 0.005”) need paraphrasing.
17- The odds ratios in the text and Table 3 were different. Please correct this.
Discussion:
18- In the Discussion section, you should first describe the main finding(s), especially their novelty, and then refer to other studies.
19- It concentrates on the new and important aspects of the study and the conclusions reached. The Discussion should emphasize the present findings and the differences or similarities between them and those

of other related studies.
20- A limitations and recommendations section is essential in this presentation.
Conclusion:
21- The conclusion was not justified. It should be based on the actual findings of your study.
thank you

Associate Editor MAJOR REVISION 16 Mar 2023

Dear EIC,
The manuscript can be published after the revisions requested by the reviewers.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 17 Mar 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the article. It needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

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.

Reviewer 1:
comments for authors:
in children jcp
1- It is cross sectional study, therefore "effect" or causing" was not defined by this study design. Pl delete "effect" from title and main text, in whole of manuscript. You could express only the prevalence data and risk ratio (association)

Change to influence

.
2- We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: SRNS, LBW and etc.

Your advice were done

Abstract:
3- Result section is not correct. You said "In the steroid-responsive subgroup, low birth weight was significantly higher than in the steroid responsive group.

Steroid -resistant is correct

4- Furthermore, If this study was Cross-sectional study the occur at a single point in time, evaluating for the condition in question, and these studies can generate prevalence data for condition not correlation or causing and etc because There are many confounding factors in the studies about children.
Pl adds prevalence date of low birth weight in steroid-responsive and steroid-resistance groups.

this study is cross sectional and we found only a significant association between lowbirth weight,higher relapse rates,steroid resistance

Introduction:
5- This was so long. It seems lecture note. Unrelated sentences about aim of study must be omitted.

The unnecessary senesce were deleted

6- The introduction should include a better representation of the main rationale of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies. But I did not see anymore.
I ask you the critical question: Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? Pl explains it in more detail.

In 59-60 was worthen the main of study, this sentences also added.

Because nephrotic syndrome has many causes, including genetic and environmental causes, and according to contradictory studies on the effect of low birth weight on the incidence of nephrotic syndrome and response to treatment, as well as the frequency of low birth weight babies in this province, this study was designed

6- What this presentation adds to conventional and proven reader sciences?

Our presentation will adding to the particular knowledge that preterm newborns were excluded from the study, perhaps due to the side effects of the results that are depends on kidney functions.

7- Line 43, what was INS?!and FSGN was written twice.

These sentences were removed due to the length of the introduction

Methods:
8- This format of methods section was not justified and difficult to follow. It needs revision totally. The format reorganized based on the reviewer's interest
9- Pl see the STROBE check list
10- What was Study design? Pl note it.

The study noted as a cross sectional because of the procedure and the process and finally the target.
11- What was sampling methods?

The study, despite of following the patients during 10 years, is a cross sectional study. We consider all the patients who referred to the clinics within these 10 years. So the sampling method is census.

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

When we did census, there is no need to calculated the sample size

13- You said 90% of subjects were steroid-responsive but in results section 162 children were steroid-sensitive (SS) and 97 were steroid-resistant (SR).!! pl explain it precise and clearly.

This comments somehow are weird and confusing. this information is not in our methods.

*The followed paragraph is in results that not explained in the methods "*259 children participated in this study, which divided them into two groups: 162 children were steroid-sensitive (SS) and 97 were steroid-resistant (SR). Steroid-sensitive Nephrotic Syndrome (62.5% vs. 37.5%) is more common in children than steroid-resistant Nephrotic Syndrome*"*
14- The number of Eligibility and finally, enrolment in each group should be mentioned precise and clear.

All the needed information in methods is correct based on the study type and procedure.

Results:
15- Line 92-94 (statistical methods) must be moved to methods section

. The statistical method was written in the method

16- Line 97-98 (When compared to the steroid-invulnerable group, the steroid-sensitive group had a birth weight of 3.0 0.54 versus 2.77 0.66; p = 0.005) needs paraphrases.

The results were corrected

17- Odd ratio in text and table 3 were different. !!!! pl correct it. *The comment considered and done needed correction.*

Discussion:
18- In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first and then allude to other studies.

The results of our study were given at the beginning of the discussion

19- 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.

In line 115 and 116, the results are contrary to most studeis

20- Limitation and recommendation part in this presentation is essential.

In line 149, the limitations of the study are mentioned

Conclusion:
21- Conclusion was not justified. It should be noted based on real finding of your study.

Suggestions have been modified

thank you

Reviewer 2:
Thank you for sending such an article. A few comments regarding your manuscript are as following:
1- Renal insufficiency is not a criterion for nephrotic syndrome. Please correct it.

Renal insufficiency was removed

2- Please define your keywords according to your study.

Keyword definitions are written in the method

3- You wrote kind growth instead of kidney growth. Please correct it.

Were corrected

4- You mentioned “proteinuria (less than 40 mg/m2 /h or excretion protein/creatinine percentage less than 200 mg/Ml”. Please correct it.
5- Please correct definition of SRNS and relapse in your article according to last guideline of IPNA.

Definitions were written based on IPNA

6- The sentence about average age needs revision. Please consider it.

The average age in each group was corrected

7- Ikuzemi’s study description is unclear. Please consider it.

The author's results were carefully written

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 11 Apr 2023 – 5 May 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 11 Apr 2023

Comments to the Author:
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there is much room for further improvement, which the authors should consider. The following points are of concern, and major suggestions are noted below. Several important questions were asked, especially in the methods section, but no precise answers were given. Please respond to the comments point by point in the response-to-reviewer file.

Title
1- This was a cross-sectional study conducted at a single point in time to evaluate the condition in question. Such studies can generate prevalence data for a condition, but not data on correlation, causation, influence, etc. Please correct this.
Abstract
2- In the results section, please add prevalence data for low birth weight in the steroid-responsive and steroid-resistant groups and compare the two groups.
3- You said "OR=1.06, 95% 16 CI 0.34–0.99)"!!! How was the OR 1.06 when the maximum was 0.99? Please explain.
Methods
4- Line 86, page 8 (PDF FILE), you said "The average age at disease in the subjects was 5.35 years (SD: 6.18 years (SD: 2.89 years) in the SS group." Please complete and correct this precisely.
5- Line 90, please correct and complete this: ((1.06 0.65 versus 1.91 0.83; p = 0.001)!!!
6- Line 91, the definition of LBW (Low birth weight (born weighing less than 5 pounds, 8 ounces, or 2,500 grams)) should be moved to the methods section. It does not belong in the results section.
7- Again, Lines 93-94, OR=1.06, 95% 16 CI 0.34–0.99)!!! How was the OR 1.06 when the maximum was 0.99? Please explain.
Conclusion:
8- The conclusion is not yet justified. It should be based on the real findings of your study. You did not study the effect or harm of LBW. This study only showed a higher prevalence of LBW in subjects with SS nephritic syndrome.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 5 May 2023

Dear EIC,
Comments to the Author:
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there is some room for further improvement which the authors should consider. The reviewers' comments, points, and suggestions are marked in the review.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 5 May 2023

Dear Author,
Some errors still exist. Please revise the manuscript based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

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.

Reviewer 1:

Comments to the Author:

The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there are many rooms for further improvement which the authors should consider. The following points are of concern and major suggestions are marked in the following. Several important questions were asked, especially in the methods section, but no precise answer was given. Pl answers to comments point to point in file of answer to reviewer.

Title

1- this study was Cross-sectional study the occur at a single point in time, evaluating for the condition in question, and these studies can generate prevalence data for condition not correlation or causing and influence and etc. pl correct it. We did and corrected with this ttile' **The prevalence of Low Birth weight in children with Nephrotic syndrome**

"

Abstract

2- In results section, Pl adds prevalence data of low birth weight in steroid-responsive and steroid-resistance groups and compare that in two groups. See the abstract section we did this correction.

3- You said "OR=1.06, 95% 16 CI 0.34–0.99)!!! How OR was 1.06 but maximum was 0.99. pl explain it. Corrected because of Word version in different systems

Methods

4- Line 86, page 8 (PDF FILE), you said "The average age at disease in the subjects was 5.35 years (SD: 6.18 years (SD: 2.89 years) in the SS group. pl complete and correct it, precise. Corrected and kindly see the related section

5- Line 90, Pl correct and complete it ((1.06 0.65 versus 1.91 0.83; p = 0.001)!!! Corrected and kindly see the related section

6- Line 91 the definition of LBW (Low birth weight (born weighing less than 5 pounds, 8 ounces, or 2,500 grams) should be moved to methods section. it was not belong to results section. Deleted extra information and corrected properly

7- Again, Line 93-94, OR=1.06, 95% 16 CI 0.34–0.99)!!! How OR was 1.06 but maximum was 0.99. pl explain it. Corrected

Conclusion:

8- Conclusion was not justified, yet. It should be noted based on real finding of your study. You did not study the effect or harm of LBW. This study did only show the higher prevalence of LBW in SS nephritic syndrome subject. We changed the conclusion to be in line with the main findings.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 22 May 2023 – 14 Jun 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 22 May 2023

Comments for authors:
Thank you for presenting this subject. All comments were addressed by the authors. Now, I think this is suitable for publication.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 14 Jun 2023

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the manuscript again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated.
The authors have addressed all comments.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 14 Jun 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for correcting the pitfalls and answering all questions. Your manuscript is acceptable now.