Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 16 · Issue 1 · e148125

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Predictive Factors for Duration of Fever in Neutropenic Febrile Episodes in Children with Cancer

Elham Shahgholi, Mohsen Jafari, Mohammad Kajiyazdi, Mohammad Ali Ehsani, Mahdi Lahni

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
15 May 2024	26 Jan 2025	25 Feb 2025	10.5812/jcp-148125

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 8
3 **Revision 2** Houman Hashemian, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11
4 **Revision 3** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 12
Authors' reply to reviewers 13
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

4 comments · 19 May 2024 – 29 Jun 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 19 May 2024

Dear Author
Thank you for your submission.
Overall, it is a well-designed study. Please check the English and recheck the variables mentioned in the Method and Result parts.
ABSTRACT:
1- Please add central catheter to the list of variables in the results part and recheck that no significant findings have been omitted from this part.
2- Please check the keywords against MESH.
Material and Method:
1- Please check the study type. Is this a cross-sectional study?
2- The study population can be children admitted with FN, not outpatients who were admitted.
3- Please give the definition of FN with a reference.
4- How did you calculate the sample size, what was the sampling method, and how did you control for bias?
Results:
1- Please check if it is necessary to describe specific statistical issues such as the intercept model.
2- Please recheck table 3. It cannot present the findings comprehensively.
Discussion:
1- Please give your interpretation of the differences between the results of your study and those of other studies.
2- Please don't give the goal of your study in the discussion part.
3- Please give the advantages and disadvantages of your study.
4- Please add the conclusion part.
Best Regards

Houman Hashemian Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 28 Jun 2024

With thanks to the respected authors for their valuable research, I would like to mention the following:
1- It is recommended that the inclusion criteria state that the children have malignancy and/or have recently received chemotherapy.
2- The first paragraph of the discussion is basically a statement of the problem and the need to conduct the research, which were mentioned in the introduction, and therefore it can be removed or at least summarized.
3- Determining a cut-off for CRP and fever at the time of admission as predictors of the risk of fever and neutropenia increases the practicality of the research findings and is recommended.
Good luck.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 29 Jun 2024

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors and appreciation to the researchers.
The authors aimed to determine the predictive factors of fever duration in Iranian pediatric patients with FN.

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 reviewers' comments.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 29 Jun 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.

Responses to Reviewers' Comments

Predictive Factors for Duration of Fever in neutropenic febrile episodes in Children With Cancer

We thank the reviewers for their valuable comments. We have revised the paper in the light of all these comments. The revisions can be tracked in the revised manuscript as they appear in red. We have also .provided our responses to all comments

Pls add central catheter to the
list of variables in result part and recheck the significant findings not being missed in this part.
• Answer: We appreciate the reviewer's comment. The revised manuscript (para 1 -page 2) has been modified accordingly.
•
2- Pls check the key words with MESH
• Answer: We appreciate the reviewer's comment. All keywords have been checked with MESH.

• Material & method:
-1 *Pls check the study type. Is this a cross-sectional study?*
• Answer: We appreciate the comment. The revised manuscript (Page1-para2 & page 3, para3) has been modified to address the comment.

• 2-*The study population can be the admitted children with FN, not outpatients who were admitted.*
• Answer: We appreciate comment. The revised manuscript (Pg 3, Par 1, Ln 3) has been modified to address the comment.

• 3- *Pls give the definition of FN with reference.*
• Answer: We appreciate the comment. An appropriate reference has been cited for the definition of neutropenia.(Ref 1).The revised manuscript (Pg 3, Par 2, Ln10) has been modified to address the comment.

• 4- *How did you calculate the sample size, what was the sampling Method, how did you control the bias.?*

• Answer: The sampling process has been done in a simple method and all available patients, who met the inclusion criteria, have been included in the study. The confounding variables that may cause bias were included in the exclusion criteria of our study. For further clarity, we have explained the sampling process and the exclusion criteria in the revised manuscript (Pg 3, Par 2, Ln 10-14).

• Results:
• *1- Pls check if it is necessary to describe specific statistical issues such as intercept model*.
• Answer: We appreciate the comment. The revised manuscript (Pg 4, Par 3-, Ln 20-21) has been modified accordingly.

• *2- Pls recheck table 3 . it cannot show the findings as a comprehensive information.*
• Answer: Table 3 has been summarized and modified accordingly along with necessary explanations for further clarity. The revised manuscript (Pg 4, Par 3-, Ln 20-21, Pg 5, Par 2, Ln 10-17, Table 3, Pg 17-Pg 22) has been modified to address the comment.

• Discussion
• *1- Pls give your interpretation of different result of your study with other studies.*
• Answer: We appreciate the reviewer's comments. The discussion section hasbeen totally revised, as requested.

2- Pls don't give the goal of your study in the discussion part
• Answer: We appreciate the comment. The discussion section has been totally revised, as requested.

3- Pls give advantages and disadvantages of your study.
• Answer: We appreciate the reviewer's comments. The discussion section (page 6- para2) has been revised, as requested.
•
4- Pls add the conclusion part
• The conclusion section was included in the revised manuscript.
• Answer: We appreciate the comment. The conclusion section (page 7- para1) has been included in the revised manuscript.

• **Reviewer 2:**
• *1- It is recommended to mention in the inclusion criteria that the children have malignancy and/or recent chemotherapy.*
• Answer: We appreciate the comment. The study characteristics and inclusion criteria section (page 3) was revised, as requested.

• *2- The first paragraph of the discussion is basically the statement of the problem and the necessity of conducting research that was mentioned in the introduction and therefore it can be removed or at least summarized.*
• Answer: The discussion section of article (page5-6) has been revised to address the comment. Also, the conclusion section (page 7) was included in the revised manuscript.

• *3- Determining a cut-off for CRP and fever at the time of admission as predictors of the risk of fever and neutropenia increases the practicality of the research findings and is recommended.*
• Answer: The cut - off for CRP > 90 as a predictor for the risk of fever and neutropenia was mentioned in the abstract and results section. The revised manuscript has been modified to &address the comment.(abstract and page 5 , paragraph 3)

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 15 Nov 2024 – 21 Nov 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 Nov 2024

Dear Author
Thank you for the correction.
Abstract:
1- Please check the word count in the abstract.
2- In this sentence ". Independent protective factors were severity of neutropenia (P = 0.01), patients' general condition (P=0.02), higher temperature>=39°C (P = 0.006), higher serum CRP>90 ...."
Please change "protective" to "predictive".
Material and Method:
1- What are the name and characteristics of your center? Is it a referral hospital? Which ward?
2- What is the ethics code?
3- What is the reference for the patient management section?
4- Did high-risk or low-risk cases with neutropenia have an effect on fever duration?
5- How did you calculate the sample size?
Discussion:
1- Please check all variables and provide literature review results for their statistical outcomes.
2- Give the results of Iranian studies if possible.
3- What are the advantages and disadvantages of your study?
Best regards

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 21 Nov 2024

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

I would like to extend my gratitude to the authors for their contribution and commend the researchers for their valuable work presented in the manuscript. However, I believe that certain revisions are necessary, and I kindly request the authors to consider incorporating these suggested changes based on the provided comments.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 21 Nov 2024

Dear Author,
Your manuscript still needs some revision. Please revise it 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.

Responses to Reviewers' Comments

Predictive Factors for Duration of Fever in neutropenic febrile episodes in Children With Cancer

We thank the reviewers for their valuable comments. We have revised the paper in the light of all these comments. The revisions can be tracked in the revised manuscript as they appear in yellow. .We have also provided our responses to all comments

Pls add central catheter to the list of variables in result part and recheck the significant findings not being missed in this part.

Abstract
Pls check for word number in abstract -1

We appreciate the reviewer's comment. The revised abstract has been modified

In this sentence ". Independent protective factors were severity of neutropenia (P = 0.01), -2 patients' general condition (P=0.02), higher temperature>=39°C (P = 0.006), higher serum .... CRP>90
We appreciate the comment p.1-para.2
:Material and Method
?What is the name and characteristics of your center, Is it a referral hospital, Which Ward -1

We appreciate the comment:p2-pra5
What is the Ethical code -2

We appreciate the comment:p3-pra1
?What is the reference for patient management part -3

We appreciate the comment:p2-pra5
?Did high risk or low risk cases with neutropenia have an effect on fever duration -4

We appreciate the comment:p6-pra4
?How did you calculate the sample size -5

We appreciate the comment:p2-pra5
:Discussion
Pls check for all variables and give literature review results for their statistical outcomes -1

We appreciate the comment:p10-table 2 and p11 –table3
Give the result of Iranian studies if possible -2

We appreciate the comment: Articles related to Iran are limited and the results are similar to .ours
?What are the advantages and disadvantages of your study -3

We appreciate the comment:p6-pra4

Best regards

3 Revision 2

4 comments · 27 Dec 2024 – 18 Jan 2025

Houman Hashemian Reviewer

ACCEPT 27 Dec 2024

With respect, my points have been implemented by the esteemed authors of the article, and in my opinion, the article is currently complete and suitable for publication.

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 17 Jan 2025

Dear Author
Thank you for the correction.
Please check the following notes.
1- Material and Method
- What is the simple method of sampling?
- Confounding variables that may cause bias cannot be included in the study's exclusion criteria. The effects of these variables are calculated by statistical analysis. Please check with your statistical analyst.
- Please provide a reference for the treatment protocol.
2- Result
- Please provide a confidence interval for your P value findings.
Best regards

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 18 Jan 2025

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
There is still a need for revisions. I encourage the authors to review and address the comments provided in order to enhance the quality of the manuscript.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 18 Jan 2025

Dear Author,
Your manuscript still needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

4

Revision 3

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 2:
Dear Author
Thank you for correction
Please check for few notes
1- Material and Method
- What is the simple method of sampling

The sampling method is explained in detail in the Study characteristics section.
- Confounding variables that may cause bias cannot included in the study's exclusion criteria . The effect of these variables are calculated by statistical analysis. Pls check with you statistical analyser.

In our study, there were no confounding variables except for the dose and type of chemotherapy drug, which were standardized across all subjects.
- Pls give reference for treatment protocol

The text was revised and our reference regarding the treatment method was added.
2- Result
- Pls give Confidence Interval for your P value findings

Table 3 was revised, confidence intervals were inserted. There are no confidence intervals available for the qualitative variables in Table 2.
Best regards

4 Revision 3

3 comments · 19 Feb 2025 – 25 Feb 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 19 Feb 2025

Accepted

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 25 Feb 2025

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 25 Feb 2025

Dear AUTHOR,
Thank you for your explanation, and I find your manuscript acceptable.