Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Volume 12 · Issue 1 · e132843

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Association Between the Maternal Body Mass Index and the Birth Weight of Infants Born

Marjan Mohammadnuri, Parisa Shojaei, Mahsa Khanjari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
2 Nov 2022	3 Jan 2023	10 Jan 2023	10.5812/jcrps-132843

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** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

2 comments · 21 Nov 2022 – 21 Nov 2022

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 21 Nov 2022

Major Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 21 Nov 2022

Major 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.

Reviewer 1:

1-topic is within the scope of the journal.

2- it is not a new *subject.it* has done before in different setting

3- title is proper and reflect the goal of paper.

4-abstract is okay.

5- the structure of introduction is correct.

6- it needs bigger sample size to be more reliable.

7- Discussion needs more article to be completed: This article has a word limit and the conclusion part cannot be written more than this

Reviewer 2:

Abstract

1. Use the approved name of your university. Was corrected

2. The answer to the main purpose of the study is not mentioned in the results. *Was corrected*

3. In the results section (even in the abstract), the results should be presented without any interpretation (lines 20-24). Was corrected

4. The keyword "Hospital" seems irrelevant. Instead "Gestational weight gain" can be one of the keywords. Was corrected

Introduction

5. Reasons to justify the necessity of conducting this research are not given. One sentence was added because this magazine has a word limit and many sentences cannot be added to this article

Materials And Methods

6. It seems that the values were not used correctly to calculate the sample size. The sample size is correctly calculated according to the numbers below:

$$288 = 0.0025 \div 0.25 \times 0.75 \times 1.96 \times 1.96$$

7. The sampling method as well as the data collection method should be explained. Methods of sampling was random sampling. Data collection was explained in article.

8. The description of how the data is collected is vague (The information collection form is different from a checklist. Also, did the data collection form only include demographic information?). Was corrected

9. Incompleteness of health records is stated as a criterion for exclusion. Was it necessary in this study? Not necessary and was corrected

10. Is your sample representative of the target population? It will definitely not be a representative of the target community, but since this number was calculated according to the formula, it is defensible.

11. It is necessary to define terms such as the poverty line in the method section.

The poverty line is one of the options related to family income and it is not the only variable of this study. Therefore, if we want to define it in the study method section, it is irrelevant to the rest of the sections and we have to exclude the variables related to all other variables such as education, maternal preeclampsia, maternal parity, etc.

Results

11. The title of the tables should be completed. Remove extra lines (scientific tables only have 3 horizontal lines). The title of the tables cannot be longer, and there is a word limit for this magazine, and the title of the tables is complete, and if we remove the lines of the tables, the variables will be confused and ambiguous.

12. In the tables, the type of statistical test used for each p-value should be mentioned as footnotes. The test used in Table 2 is wrongly stated as a t-test in the text (lines 94-95).

Was corrected

13. The statements about the results in some cases do not seem correct (lines 92-93 and 100-103). Being numerically more does not matter. Only the statistical difference should be provided for each variable. Was corrected

14. Considering the similar variables, it may be appropriate to merge tables 1, 2, and 3. Table 2 does not have more information than Table 3 (Table 2 can be deleted). Table 2 helps to explain more

15. In table 2, "natural weight" is mentioned incorrectly instead of "normal weight".

Discussion Was corrected

16. The conclusions should be based on the results of this study, so it is better to avoid generalizations (please specify the intended outcomes in lines 126-127). Was corrected

17. Arguments about the generalizability of the results are not mentioned in the discussion.

Was corrected

18. The limitations of this study are not discussed. Was corrected

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 3 Jan 2023 – 3 Jan 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 3 Jan 2023

Minor Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 3 Jan 2023

Minor Revision

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.

1. The approved name of your university is “Islamic Azad University, Tehran Medical Sciences”. Was corrected
2. In sample size calculation, Weight loss among infants is not a relevant outcome for your research; in addition, with a 7.5% prevalence, the p in the formula will be 0.075. Also, the reference to this value is not mentioned. Was corrected
3. It is not enough to claim random sampling; the sampling method should be described. Was corrected
4. It is better to mention the statistical test used in the subtitle of the tables. Was corrected
5. In line 170 “low BMI women” is correct. Was corrected

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 10 Jan 2023 – 10 Jan 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 10 Jan 2023

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 10 Jan 2023

Accept