Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 14 · Issue 3 · e136070

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Pediatric Dilemma of the Third Wave Pandemic of COVID-19 in A Tertiary Care Hospital for Children

Hoda Atef Abdelsattar Ibrahim, Rasha Gamal, Mona Mohsen, Aya Ahmed Amin, Yasmeen AbdElSalam, Miriam Magdy Aziz

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
4 Mar 2023	25 Mar 2023	8 Apr 2023	10.5812/compreped-136070

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, Houman Hashemian, 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 12

1 Original submission

4 comments · 10 Mar 2023 – 21 Mar 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Mar 2023

Thank you for your efforts on this manuscript, but I have some questions:
I suggest changing the format of this manuscript to "letter to editor" or "Rapid Communication"; this seems better and more reasonable.
1- Grammar and reasoning: need complete revision.
Abstract:
2- The aim of the study is not precise.
3- Beginning a sentence with a number is not suitable (404; 58!).
4- Study design? Date? Setting?
5- What were the diagnostic criteria for a negative COVID-19 test according to the Egyptian Ministry of Health protocol? How did you confirm that the subjects tested negative for COVID-19?
Introduction:
6- This section was very weak and needs complete revision.
7- The introduction should include a better presentation of the main rationale of the study and emphasize the limitations of previous studies. However, I did not see these elements.
8- The objectives of the study should be defined in the introduction.
9- Many studies have been done in this regard. Why did the authors decide to conduct this study again? Please state your new messages and the novelty of the study. Objectives should be expressed clearly and precisely.
10- What does this presentation add to readers' established scientific knowledge? Please explain this precisely.
Methods:
11- Study design?
12- Again, what were the diagnostic criteria for a negative COVID-19 test according to the Egyptian Ministry of Health protocol? How did you confirm that the subjects tested negative for COVID-19 and had normal chest CT findings? Please define this precisely and clearly.
Results:
13- Did you use CXR and CT or other modalities for all subjects?
14- Please present the patients' radiological reports.
15- Please define respiratory distress precisely and clearly. What were the criteria?
Discussion:
16- In the discussion section, you should first describe the main finding(s), especially the novelty, and then refer to other studies.
17- A recommendations section is essential in this presentation and should be included in the last paragraph of the discussion.
thank you

Houman Hashemian Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 18 Mar 2023

Thanks to the authors of the manuscript "Pediatric dilemma of the third wave pandemic of Covid-19 in a tertiary care hospital for children":
Abstract: The frequency and percentage of male patients and the average and range of the patients' ages should be given in the results.

Background: The aim of the study is not mentioned.

Results: At the beginning of the results section, the total number of patients studied and confirmed cases of COVID-19 should be mentioned. The inclusion and exclusion criteria should also be well explained. Please also pay attention to the following items:
1- You have defined the inclusion criteria based on "Children were considered having positive infection when they are tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR test; and high-resolution chest C.T. showed findings specific for COVID-19". Does that mean that while the CT scan shows involvement, some patients did not have respiratory symptoms or hypoxia? This item needs to be further explained in the discussion, or the inclusion criteria should be changed as follows: "Children were considered having positive infection when they are tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR test; and/or high-resolution chest C.T. showed findings specific for COVID-19".
2- You reported 58 patients with COVID-19, but the statistics presented in the tables are based on the total number of patients, i.e., 404 patients. This is correct only if the inclusion criteria of the study are either a positive test for COVID-19 or confirmatory clinical symptoms and a CT scan of the lung consistent with COVID-19 (as mentioned above), and all 404 patients have one of these two conditions.
Good luck

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 21 Mar 2023

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs a full revision of the Abstract. Also, the manuscript should be edited by a professional English editor.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 21 Mar 2023

Dear Author,
The manuscript has fundamental errors. Please revise it based on the comments. We will decide about it after revision.

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.

Point by Point Response to reviewers

Reviewers 1 :

Thank You for your valuable comments , The required revisions were done and highlighted by yellow in the manuscript

Reviewer’s comments :

1- Grammar and reasoning: need complete revising.
Done

2- The aim of the study is not precise.

This aim was updated and mentioned in the abstract .The aim is description of the demographic , clinical and lab criteria of suspected children with COVID -19 , and to raise attention regards the atypical manifestations with their lab criteria

3. The beginning of sentence with number is not suitable (404; 58!).

This was updated and changed

4. - Study design? Date? Setting?

This was clarified in the abstract and methods sections

5. What were the diagnostic criteria for COVID- 19 negative test according to the Egyptian Ministry of Health protocol? How did you confirm the COVID- 19 negative test subjects?

The diagnostic criteria were set according to the swabs results and/or the specific findings of CT scan . This was clarified in the methods sections

6. Introduction: It section was so week and need revision, totally.

The background or the introduction has been updated

7. 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.

The main rationale was updated and set in the introduction and it was to describe the clinic laboratory profile in children with suspected COVID-19 . Data on children may be limited regards the main presentations and causes of admissions and lab criteria , hence our study was carried out. This was updated and mentioned in the manuscript

8. The objects of study should be defined in the introduction.

Updated and Done

9. Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? Pl expressed our new messages and novelty. Objects should be expressed, clearly and precise .

10. What this presentation adds to conventional and proven reader sciences? Pl explains it, precise.

Yes, many studies had been conduced in adults with COVID-19 infections and some on children. However, few studies had been done on children with suspected COVID-19 infection. Suspicions and early prediction of this disease are very important for better outcomes and prevention of infections. Additionally, correlating the presentations with the systems affected is valuable for the health provider to help set wider differential

diagnosis and so, set preliminary diagnosis through which actions may be taken earlier for better prognosis. We can see in our study that not all children with respiratory distress had respiratory origin of the disease, a child might have respiratory distress due to GIT infections and diarrhea through the metabolic acidosis . Another strength of our study is correlating the lab criteria with the presentations. It seems that they are significantly changed in children whose manifestations were non-respiratory manifestations. The strength of our study has been updated and supplied in the manuscript

11. - Study design?

Was updated and clarified

12. Again, what were the diagnostic criteria for COVID- 19 negative test according to the Egyptian Ministry of Health protocol? How did you confirm the COVID- 19 negative test, normal chest CT subjects? Pl define it precise and clearly.

Was updated and clarified

13. Did you take CXR and CT or others modalities for all subjects?

Imaging was done to children who had respiratory manifestations and this was updated and clarified in the manuscript

14. Pl expressed the radiological reports of patients.

The specific criteria in CT for COVID-19 confirmation seen in the enrolled children were ground-glass opacities with bilateral peripheral distribution and this was updated and clarified in methods section . Any other non-specific criteria were not recorded

15. - Pl defines respiratory distress, precise and clear. What were criteria?

Definitions and scoring for respiratory distress were updated and supplied in the methods section

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

Updated and done . The finding of greater importance were discussed first and the discussion was rearranged

17. Recommendation part in this presentation is essential and should be expressed in last paragraph of discussion.

Recommendation part was updated and supplied

Reviewers 2 :

Thank You for your valuable comments , The required revisions were done and highlighted by yellow in the manuscript

Reviewer’s comments :

1. Abstract: The frequency and percentage of male patients and the average and range of the patients' age should be given in the results.

   Updated and done

2. Background: The aim of the study is not mentioned.

Updated and mentioned

3. At the beginning of the results section, the total number of studied patients and confirmed cases of Covid-19 should be mentioned.

   Done

4. The inclusion and exclusion criteria should also be well explained.
   Done in the methods section

5. Please also pay attention to the following items:
   1- You have defined the inclusion criteria based on: "Children were considered having positive infection when they are tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR test; and high-resolution chest C.T. showed findings specific for COVID-19". Does that mean that while the CT scan shows involvement, some patients did not have respiratory symptoms or hypoxia? This item needs to be further explained in the

discussion or to inclusion change the criteria as follows: "Children were considered having positive infection when they are tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR test; and/or high-resolution chest C.T. showed findings specific for COVID-19".

Has been updated and changed in the method section

6. You announced the number of 58 patients with Covid-19, but the statistics presented in the tables are based on the total number of patients, i.e., 404 patients. This is correct only if the inclusion criteria of the study are either a positive test for Covid-19 or confirming clinical symptoms and CT scan of the lung consistent with covid-19 (as mentioned above), and all 404 patients have one of these two conditions.

Done. Yes, the inclusion criteria are all children with suspected COVID-19 infection (404) for confirmation of infection.

Thank you so much

Sincerely

The authors

7

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 26 Mar 2023 – 8 Apr 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 Mar 2023

Comments for authors
I reviewed the manuscript again. All concerns were answered properly. In my opinion, the revised paper was good enough to be accepted for publication.
Thanks

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 8 Apr 2023

Dear EIC,
I read the manuscript, and the authors corrected the requested items. The article could be accepted at this stage.
Sincerely;

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 8 Apr 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for paying attention and responding to the reviewer's comments.