Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 15 · Issue 3 · e144672

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Correlation Between Lung Clearance Index (LCI) and Forced Expiratory Volume (FEV_1) in Children with Cystic Fibrosis (CF): A Cross-sectional Study

Mohammadreza Modaresi, Babak Rafizadeh, Kambiz Eftekhari, Rohola Shirzadi, Fateme Tarighatmonfared, Seyed Hossein Mirlohi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
4 Jan 2024	10 Feb 2024	5 Mar 2024	10.5812/jcp-144672

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** Ghamartaj Khanbabaee, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

3 comments · 17 Jan 2024 – 21 Jan 2024

Ghamartaj Khanbabaee Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Jan 2024

This work is new and valuable but is expensive. Of course, this measure is more sensitive and easy to do.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 21 Jan 2024

Dear EIC,
The study aimed to evaluate the correlation between LCI and FEV1 in cystic fibrosis patients.
The manuscript is a valuable piece of research. But some revisions are needed. The authors should revise it based on the comments. Also, minor changes should be made to the text:
A section on limitations and recommendations is essential in this presentation and should be included in the last paragraph of the discussion.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 21 Jan 2024

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.

Dear Reviewers

Thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Your comments were performed and highlighted in the text of the articles.

Thank you for your kindness

Reviewer 1

In Abstract

1. It seems that the keywords are not included in the mesh. Be sure to check.

Changes were made to the text

In Introduction

2. The objective(s) and cause(s) of the study should more clearly state. Its necessity has not been determined.

The purpose and necessity of the study were explained.

In Materials and methods

3. What is the reason for using this method?

We used a cross-sectional study in which we can measure the relationship between two items FEV1 and LCI. In fact, according to the ethical limitations, we did not directly intervene on the patients and performed both diagnostic methods for the patients. We tried to control all confounding factors in the study

In Results

4. Tables of this paper is not based on author guide and journal style

The tables were modified.

In Discussion

5. It is necessary to mention the limitations of the study.

Study limitations were added.

In References

6. Mostly are not in the style of journal.

The references were adjusted according to the style of the journal.

Reviewer 2

This work is new and valuable but is expensive. of course this measure is more sensitive and easy to do.

Thank you very much for your attention

You are exactly right, this method is an expensive but valuable method.

Associate Editor 1:

Dear EIC,

The study was aimed to evaluate the correlation between LCI and FEV1 in cystic fibrosis patients.

The manuscript is a valuable research. But some revisions are needed. Authors should revise it based on comments. Also minor changes should be done in text:

Limitation and recommendation part in this presentation is essential and should be expressed in last paragraph of discussion.

Dear editor

Thank you very much for your attention and kindness.

Final revisions were made based on the comments of the reviewers and the text of the manuscripts was highlight.

The limitation section was added in the last paragraph of the discussion.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 1 Mar 2024 – 5 Mar 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 1 Mar 2024

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 5 Mar 2024

Dear Author,
Your revisions have significantly improved the article, and it is now deemed acceptable for publication.
Congratulations on your hard work and dedication to enhancing the quality of your work.