Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 10 · Issue 4 · e111714

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Survey Method of Vascular Surgery on the Onset of Ischemic Steal Syndrome Following Vascular Access in Dialysis Patients

Seyyed Masoud Mousavi, Iraj Nazari, Rahim Chanany

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Nov 2020	26 Feb 2021	27 Feb 2021	10.5812/jjcdc.111714

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, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5

Authors' reply to reviewers 6

Reviewer and editor comments 9

3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 10

Authors' reply to reviewers 11

Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

4 comments · 9 Dec 2020 – 9 Jan 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 9 Dec 2020

Greetings, and thank you to the respected Editor for giving me the opportunity to review this article.
The present article examines an important topic, but unfortunately, its writing and methodology are weak. Some of these issues are noted below.
1. The title is not consistent with the article's content. Based on the objective stated in the problem statement, the title should be "Investigating the association between different vascular access methods and the incidence of steal syndrome in dialysis patients attending the vascular surgery clinic at Golestan Hospital in Ahvaz in ...."
2. The abstract is incomplete, which is to be expected given the many problems in the full text. The methods should briefly state the year and location of the study, the sampling method, data collection, and statistical analysis. The text could also be written more concisely. For example, instead of listing all the variables assessed before and after surgery separately, state once that these variables were assessed before and after the intervention. Another question that arises here is why diagnosis in this study was based only on physical signs, given that the article itself states that color Doppler ultrasonography is the definitive method for diagnosing steal syndrome. Is it possible to make a definitive diagnosis of steal syndrome in a patient based only on physical signs?
3. There is no need to mention table numbers or refer to tables in the abstract.
4. In the results section, given the study objective and the findings, you should report the association between demographic variables and the incidence of steal syndrome, rather than the association between surgical methods and demographic variables.
5. Overall, the issues noted in the abstract are also present throughout the article.
6. In the problem statement, in addition to explaining the different vascular access methods and their complications, you should explain the need for the study, mentioning its location and year.
7. The methods are not described well or systematically. Many details that should have been mentioned are missing, such as the sampling method, data collection method, timing of data collection, etc. Does the arterial clinic refer to the vascular surgery clinic?
8. The first and second exclusion criteria are actually inclusion criteria.
9. The last paragraph concerning the exclusion criteria is actually part of the methods and should be presented there.
10. Instead of outcome, the heading should be Data Collection Method, and the explanation should be much more detailed.
11. The study has no ethics code or project number.
12. The results and tables include only descriptive statistics. Although significance and significant associations are discussed, no p-value or r values are presented in the tables or text.
13. The discussion begins with a paragraph that has little connection to the main topic ((the incidence of steal syndrome)). Overall, the discussion is not written coherently and centers more on demographic variables than on the main topic.
14. Most of the references are more than 5 years old.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 3 Jan 2021

Dear Author
I have some comments for revising your manuscript.

Title:
It would be better to revise your title. My recommendation is: Survey method of vascular surgery on the onset of ischemic limb syndrome following vascular access in dialysis patients
Also, please revise it at the end of the introduction section.
Abstract:
-In the introduction, it is difficult to understand the meaning of this sentence: “Hypertension an important health problem in Iran and the world, is essential to be
managed through self-care behaviors.” What does this mean?
-The objective should be revised according to the title and written in a separate section.
- In the methods, ESRD should be written out rather than abbreviated. The author should also mention the sample size and sampling method.
- In the results, the author repeatedly mentions before and after; it would be better to abbreviate them.
This sentence should be deleted in the results section: “Table 3 details 18 this item.”
- The conclusion is poorly written and similar to the results; it should be revised.
- All keywords should be written according to MeSH, except Fistula.
Introduction:
In this section, the author should mention the morbidity of hemodialysis in Asia and Iran.
At the end of the introduction section, the conclusion is not suitable, and the author does not mention the reason for conducting this study.
Objective:
The objective should be revised according to the title.
Method:
In the study design part of this section, the author should revise ESRD.
In this section, “insert” should be revised.
The heading for the outcome in this section is wrong and should be procedure.
In this section, the author repeatedly mentions before and after; it would be better to abbreviate them.
The author should write the ethics code in this section.
The author should mention the sample size, sampling method, and sample size formula.

Discussion:
In this section, the first paragraph should be deleted.
In this section, many results were not compared with other research, and this section is poorly written and very long.
The author does not mention the strengths and limitations of his or her work.
The author should present the conclusion and acknowledgment in separate sections.
References:
In this section, the number of references is low; the author should add more references.
Table:
In this section, the title of table 4 is wrong.
The table 4 should be revised.
In table 1,2,3, the abbreviations should be defined below the tables.
My decision about this manuscript is: major revision

Associate Editor MAJOR REVISION 9 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field.

Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions in all sections. I recommend you revise the manuscript.
With regards.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 9 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions throughout. One of our reviewers attached a document containing comments on the manuscript. Please find it and revise your manuscript based on it. I recommend you revise the manuscript.
With regards.

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
With greetings, and thanks to the respected Editor-in-Chief for giving me the opportunity to review this article.
The present article examines an important topic, but unfortunately it has been carried out and written weakly in terms of writing and methodology. Some of these issues are noted below.
1. The title is not consistent with the text of the article. Given the aim stated in the statement of the problem, the title should be as follows: "Investigating the relationship between different vascular access methods and the incidence of steal syndrome in dialysis patients referred to the vascular surgery clinic of Golestan Hospital, Ahvaz, in the year ...."

Answer: the title changed according to your suggestion.
2. The abstract is incomplete, which, of course, is to be expected since the full text of the article contains many problems; in the Methods, the year and place of the study, the sampling method, data collection, and statistical analysis should be stated briefly. In terms of writing, the text could also be written more concisely. For example, instead of stating separately all the variables that are examined before and after the operation, it should be said once that these variables are examined before and after the intervention. A question that also arises here is: given that the text of the article also states that the definitive method for diagnosing steal syndrome is color Doppler ultrasonography, why was the diagnosis in this study made only on the basis of physical signs? And is it possible to state a definitive diagnosis of steal syndrome for a patient only by examining physical signs?

Answer:The diagnosis of steal syndrome should be done according to both physical examination and Doppler sonography and other preclinical findings and we used them for diagnosis. Patients history and physical examination confirm steal syndrome. We added the fallowing information to the manuscript.
3. In the abstract, there is no need to mention the table numbers and refer to them.

Answer: thanks for this comment. We deleted this sentence.
4. In the Results section, given the aim of the study and the results obtained, you should report the relationship between the demographic variables and the incidence of steal syndrome, not the relationship between the surgical methods and the demographic variables.

Answer: the title is based on the correlation of the method with the syndrome. The demographic features appear in the syndrome.
5. Overall, the problems mentioned for the abstract also exist throughout the article.

Answer: we revised the whole manuscript and the changes are made in red.
6. In the statement of the problem, in addition to the explanations about the types of vascular access methods and their complications, explanations should also be given about the necessity of the study, stating the place and year of the research.

Answer: thanks for this comment we used your suggestion and we added these items in the discussion.
7. The methods are not described well or systematically. Many items that should have been mentioned are not mentioned, such as the sampling method, data collection method, time of data collection, and ....

Answer: we added the items you mentioned in the text.

Does the arterial clinic mean the vascular surgery clinic?

Answer: yes
8. The first and second exclusion criteria are in fact inclusion criteria.

Answer: we corrected the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
9. The last paragraph related to the exclusion criteria is in fact part of the methods and should be stated there.

Answer: we put the paragraph in the method as you suggested.
10. Instead of outcome, it should be written "data collection method", and the explanations should be much more precise than this.

Answer: we we correct this section.
11. The project has no ethics code or project number.

Answer: we added ethical code in the acknowledgement.
12. The results and tables include only descriptive statistics, and although significance and significant relationships are mentioned, no trace of p-value or r values is seen in the tables or the text.

Answer:……
13. The Discussion begins with a paragraph that is not closely related to the main topic ((incidence of steal syndrome)). Overall, the Discussion is also not written coherently, and instead of focusing on the main topic, it is written mostly around the demographic variables.
14. The references mostly date from more than 5 years ago.

Answer: we added several up to date references.

Reviewer 2:
Dear Author
I have some comments for revising your manuscript
Title:
It is better you revise your title my recommend is this: Survey method of vascular surgery on the onset of ischemic limb syndrome following vascular access in dialysis patients
Also please revise it at the end of introduction section

Answer: thanks for your kind comment we changed the title according to your suggestion.
Abstract:

Answer: we revised the abstract.
-In the introduction it is difficult finding the meaning of this senates: Hypertension an important health problem in Iran and the world, is essential to be managed through self-care behaviors. What is this?

Answer: we did not find this term. But it means it is worldwide problem and it can be controlled via lifestyle.

-Objective should be revised according to title and wrote in separate section.

Answer: we changed the objective.
- in the method requires edit ESRD and should not be write abbreviation also the author should be mention to sample size and sampling method.

Answer: we added sample size and sampling method.
- in the result the author repeatedly mentioned before and after, it is better abbreviated them.

Answer: we correct this part.
This sentence should be deleted in the result section: Table 3 details 18 this item.

Answer: we deleted this section.
- the conclusion was writing weak and similar to result, it should be revise.

Answer: we revised results and conclusion.
- the total of key words should be written according to Mesh except Fistula.

Answer: we checked the keywords in mesh.
Introduction:
In this section the author should be mention to morbidity of hemodialysis in Asia and Iran.

Answer: we added this item.
At the end of introduction section, the conclusion is not suitable and the author did not mention to reason for implementing this study.

Answer: we revise it and delited the conclusion and added our purpose of the study.
Objective:
Objective should be revised according to title.

Answer: we revised it.
Method:
In this section at the design study the author should be revise ESRD

Answer: we revised this part.
In this section the "insert" should be revise
The title of outcome in this section is wrong and should be write procedure.

Answer we revised this part.
in this section the author repeatedly mentioned before and after, it is better abbreviated them.

Answer: we revised this part.
The author should write ethics code in this section.

Answer: we added ethic code.
the author should be mention to sample size, sampling method and sample size formula.

Answer: we correct this section.

Discussion:
In this section the first paragraph should be delete

Answer: we deleted the first paragraph.
In this section more results were not comparing whit other research and this section wrote weak and is very long.

Answer: we revised this section.
The author did not mention to strength and limitation of his or her work.

Answer: we added this section.
The author should mention to the conclusion and acknowledgment in separate section.

Answer: we corrected this section.
References:
In this section the number of references is low, should be the author add them.

Answer: we revised references.
Table:
In this section the title of table 4 is wrong

Answer: we correct the titles.
The table 4 should be revise.

Answer: we revised table 4:
In table 1,2,3 the abbreviation should be mention in the below of table.

Answer: we added the abbreviations.
My decision about this manuscript is:major revision

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 6 Feb 2021 – 21 Feb 2021

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 6 Feb 2021

Dear Author
I have some comments for revising your manuscript.
Abstract:
- The conclusion was poorly written and similar to the results; it should be revised.
Unfortunately, you did not revise the conclusion in the abstract. Please revise it.
Introduction:
At the end of the introduction section, the conclusion is not suitable, and the author did not mention the reason for conducting this study. The author did not revise it.
Discussion:
The author did not mention the strengths of his or her work. The author did not revise it.

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 Feb 2021

Dear Editor
HI
Thank you for the authors' response to the comments. Most of the intended corrections have been made, but no action has been taken yet on comment number 12. However, examining correlations is very important for enriching the content of the article and publishing it.

Thanks

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 21 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
Please address some additional comments and resubmit.
Thank you very much.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 21 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
Please pay attention to the additional revisions requested by our reviewers, revise accordingly, and then resubmit.
Thank you very much

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Editor
HI
Thanks for the response of dear authors to the comments. Most of the intended corrections have been made, but no action has been taken yet for comment number 12. While survey of correlations is very important for enriching the content of the article and publishing it.

Thanks to reviewer, this comment was modified.

Thanks

Reviewer 2:
Dear Author
I have some comments for revising your manuscript
Abstract:
- the conclusion was writing weak and like result, it should be revise.
Unfortunately, you did not revise conclusion part in the abstract, please revise it.

Thanks to reviewer, the conclusion was revised.
Introduction:
At the end of introduction section, the conclusion is not suitable, and the author did not mention to reason for implementing this study. The author did not revise it.

Thanks to reviewer, objective of the introduction was revised.
Discussion:
The author did not mention to strength of his or her work. The author did not revise it.

Thanks to reviewer, Discussion was completely modified.

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 27 Feb 2021 – 27 Feb 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 27 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
This manuscript is acceptable in the current format.
Thank you very much.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 27 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
I think all comments have been addressed and this manuscript in the current format is acceptable.
Truly Yours.