Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 14 · Issue 4 · e136258

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparison and Validity of Fragmented QRS (fQRS) Against Cardiac Magnetic Resonance (CMR) in Predicting Right Heart Function in Tetralogy of Fallot Patients After Reconstructive Surgery

Bita Zargaran, Mohammadreza Naghibi Sistani, Farhad Akhavein, Hassan Mottaghi Moghaddam Shahri

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
21 Mar 2023	24 Jun 2023	3 Jul 2023	10.5812/jcp-136258

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, vahid aminzadeh, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** vahid aminzadeh, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
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

4 comments · 10 Apr 2023 – 30 Apr 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Apr 2023

Abstract
Please define fragmented QRS when it is first mentioned in your manuscript.
Your abstract needs grammatical correction.
Your conclusion is not properly defined and mainly describes your findings.
What does “Positive clinical signs show the right side of the heart involvement.” mean?
Your keywords are not compatible with the MeSH database.
Introduction
It needs grammatical correction and better clarification. For example: “atrium of the ventricle septum, regurgitation of tricuspid; systolic of RV and left ventricle (LV); Compared to other valvupathies, PV correlated to increase mortality and morbidity; …” These statements cannot be understood at all.
Methods
It needs grammatical correction.
Please define this sentence: “We considered an additional R wave in two contiguous leads when the QRS duration is less than 120 ms.”
Results
What were your variable and cutoff point for considering RV dysfunction?
As you claimed, “ Increased RVEDV was the only CMR parameter that strongly correlated to patients who indicated PVR”, what were your criteria for considering PVR indication?
Discussion
It is completely disorganized.
Conclusion
It does not follow from your manuscript at all. It is mostly the results of your study.

vahid aminzadeh Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 24 Apr 2023

Please change the title of the article as follows:
Comparison and validity of fragmented QRS (fQRS) against cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) in predicting right heart function in tetralogy of Fallot patients after reconstructive surgery.
The quality of writing and grammar should be improved.
Before using the abbreviation PVR, write out the full term.
Similar studies should be mentioned in the text of the article.
Also, the exclusion criteria and study variables should be mentioned.
Refer to the summary of the results at the end of the discussion.
And also mention the limitations of the study.
In order to eliminate the shortcomings of the study, suggestions for future studies should be given in the text.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 30 Apr 2023

Dear EIC,
This study shows the importance of fragmented QRS in predicting right cardiac function in patients with

repaired tetralogy of Fallot compared with cardiac magnetic resonance.
It is a useful study but needs some revision. All comments should be answered by the authors, and changes should be made based on the comments.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 30 Apr 2023

Dear Author,
It is a useful study but needs some revision. All comments should be addressed by the authors, and changes should be made based on the 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.

Please define fragmented QRS for the first time mentioned in your manuscript.--> It had been stated?!

Your abstract needs grammatical correction.

Your conclusion is not properly defined and is mainly describing your findings.--> Corrected

How does “Positive clinical signs show the right side of the heart involvement.”?!!!--> The last sentence of the conclusion was deleted

Your keywords are not compatible with MeSH database.--> Corrected

Introduction

It needs grammatical correction and better clarification. For example: “atrium of the ventricle

septum, regurgitation of tricuspid; systolic of RV and left ventricle (LV); Compared to other valvupathies, PV correlated to increase mortality and morbidity; …” they are not understood at all.

Methods

It needs grammatical correction

Please define this sentence: “We considered an additional R wave in two contiguous leads when the QRS duration is less than 120 ms.-- Added → Fragmented QRS was defined as an additional R wave or notch in the nadir of the S wave in ≥ 2 contiguous leads (right-sided/septal: aVR, V1, V2; anterior: V2–V5; lateral: I, aVL, V5, V6; or inferior: II, aVF, III) in patients with QRS duration < 120 ms
Results

What was your variable and cut-off point for considering RV dysfunction?--> A new article was added to the method

As you claimed:” Increased RVEDV was the only CMR parameter that strongly correlated to patients who indicated PVR”, what was your criteria for considering PVR indication?--> A new article was added

Discussion

Conclusion

It is not concluded from your manuscript at all. It is mostly the results of your study.-->Corrected

Reviewer 2:

Please change the title of the article as follows:

Comparison and validity of fragmented QRS (fQRS) against cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) in predicting right heart function in tetralogy of fallot patients after reconstructive surgery.--> I used exactly this

The quality of writing and grammar should be improved.

Before writing the abbreviation of PVR, write its full term.--> Done

Similar studies should be mentioned in the text of the article.-->??

Also, the exclusion criteria and study variables should be mentioned.--> Done

Refer to the summary of the results at the end of the discussion.- It is stated in the text itself??!!→

And also mention the limitations of the study.--> Done

In order to eliminate the shortcomings of the study, suggestions for future studies should be given in the text.--> Done

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 14 May 2023 – 22 May 2023

vahid aminzadeh Reviewer — ACCEPT — 14 May 2023

The desired changes have been applied. The article is approved.

Referee 1 Reviewer — MAJOR REVISION — 18 May 2023

Abstract
Please define fragmented QRS when it is first mentioned in your manuscript (in the abstract or at least in the introduction).
Your abstract still needs grammatical correction.
Introduction
It still needs grammatical correction and better clarification.
Discussion
It is still disorganized.
It has a writing problem.

Associate Editor — MAJOR REVISION — 22 May 2023

Dear Author,
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there is some room for further improvement, which the authors should consider. Please follow the reviewer's instructions for improving the manuscript.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief — MAJOR REVISION — 22 May 2023

Dear Author,
Your manuscript still needs revision. Please revise it based on the 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.

Dear editor in chief,

We revised our article based on your valuable comments.

Reviewer 1:
The desired changes have been applied. The article is approved.

We appreciate it.
Reviewer 2:
Abstract
Please define fragmented QRS for the first time mentioned in your manuscript (abstract or at least introduction).

We appreciate your comment. We added it.
Your abstract still needs grammatical correction.

We appreciate your comment. We revised it.
Introduction
It still needs grammatical correction and better clarification.

We appreciate your comment. We revised it.
Discussion
It is still disorganized.

We appreciate your comment. Even the subject of sentence had not been changed.).

We appreciate your comment. We revised it.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 3 Jul 2023 – 3 Jul 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 3 Jul 2023

The manuscript is corrected and written properly.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 3 Jul 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 3 Jul 2023

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