Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 13 · Issue 4 · e146642

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Retrospective Evaluation of Clinical and Biochemical Data in Patients with Pancreatic Conditions

Meisam Moezzi, Golshan Afshari, Saeed Seyedian, Sara Sarvandian

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
3 Mar 2024	27 May 2024	16 Jun 2024	10.5812/jjcdc-146642

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, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

3 comments · 12 May 2024 – 17 May 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 12 May 2024

Thanks to the research team. The following suggestions are provided to improve this study:

1. I suggested changing the title in a way that reflects the content and methodology of the study and the research done. “Evaluation of Clinical and Biochemical Data in Patients with Pancreatic: A Retrospective study”
2. In the background of the abstract, it is better to remove the year of the study and write it in the methods section of the abstract.
3. In the methods section of the abstract, instead of writing the methods of statistical analysis, it is better to write the study design, the duration of the medical record review, and the place where the study was conducted (line 36).
4. Please check your keywords with Mesh.
5. In the introduction, similar studies and their results should be mentioned, and the introduction should be strengthened by evaluating more studies.
6. In the results, it is not stated how many patients were hospitalized during these 4 years. In fact, it is not clear what percentage of all hospitalized patients in this geographical area the 84 patients with pancreatitis represent.
Also, this percentage of hospitalizations should be compared with those in other regions of Iran and other parts of the world. I think you need to evaluate more similar studies.
7. In the discussion, lines 91-103 should have been moved to the introduction.
8. The discussion is very good. However, write the limitations at the end.
9. After making the corrections, the entire manuscript should be reviewed for typographical errors.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 17 May 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions throughout. Please use previously published related articles in your references. I recommend you revise the manuscript and resubmit it as soon as possible.
With regards.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 17 May 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions throughout. Please use previously published related articles in your references. I recommend that you revise the manuscript and resubmit it. Please see the attached file for your revision.
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.

Reviewer 1:

Dear Dr. Editor

Thank you for sending me the manuscript titled “Clinical and Biochemical Data in Patients with Pancreatic. A Retrospective evaluation”. After reading and analyzing the manuscript, I have found that it is within the scope of this journal. Additionally,

There is some positive points in the text:

- The abstract provides a summary of what was done and discovered in the text.
- The results were presented in a logical sequence throughout the text, tables, and illustrations, highlighting the most significant findings.
- The discussion has been effectively justified and substantiated. References: It has written properly and has presented in last five years.

Questions: I have identified some positive aspects, which are listed below:

1- Recommended to change title as: Retrospective Analysis of Clinical and Biochemical Characteristics in Patients with Pancreatic Conditions

Responses

First I would like to express my best gratitude for your suggestions. We apologize for the lack of detailed clarification regarding the questions mentioned in the article. With the help of your professional advice, we have made serious modifications to the manuscript.

- **The title of the manuscript was changed as follows according to comments aggregation of the referees: "Retrospective Evaluation of Clinical and Biochemical Data in Patients with Pancreatic Conditions" on Lines 1-2 as indicated by the Yellow highlight.**

2. The abstract provides a summary of what was done and discovered in the text.

- **Thank you very much for your meaningful comment**

3. In introduction: For gap of study is better to examining the local data on pancreatitis in this region can contribute to a better understanding of the disease burden and facilitate the development of appropriate preventive and management strategies.

- **Thank you very much for your meaningful comments. We apologize for not clarifying in detail the above questions you have addressed in the article. With your suggested assistance, we have made modifications to the introduction section on Lines 46-56 as indicated by the Yellow highlight.**

Reviewer 2:

Thanks to the research team, suggestions are provided to improve this study:

Questions:

1. I suggested changing the title in a way that reflects the content and methodology of the study and the research done. “Evaluation of Clinical and Biochemical Data in Patients with Pancreatic: A Retrospective study”

Responses

- **First I would like to express my best gratitude for your suggestions. We apologize for the lack of detailed clarification regarding the questions mentioned in the article. With the help of your professional advice, we have made serious modifications to the manuscript.**

- **The title of the manuscript was changed as follows according to comments aggregation of the referees: "Retrospective Evaluation of Clinical and Biochemical Data in Patients with Pancreatic Conditions "on Lines 1-2 as indicated by the Yellow highlight.**

2. In the background of the abstract, it is better to remove the year of the study and write it in method of the abstract.

- **Thank you very much for your suggestions. I have made the mentioned modifications to the abstract section on Line 8 as indicated by the Aqua blue highlight.**

3. In the method of the abstract, instead of writing the methods of statistical analysis, it is better to write the study design, the duration of the review of medical records and the place where it is conducted (line 36).

- **Thank you very much for your meaningful comments. I have made the mentioned modifications to the abstract section on Lines 11-13 as indicated by the Aqua blue highlight.**

4. Please check your keywords with Mesh

    - **Thank you very much for your suggestions. Your professional input has greatly enhanced the quality of our manuscript. I have made the changes to the keywords to align with MeSH on Lines 22-23 as indicated by the Aqua blue highlight.**

5. In introduction, similar studies and their results should be mentioned in the introduction, and the introduction should be revised more strongly by evaluating more studies.

    - **Thank you very much for your meaningful comments. We apologize for not clarifying in detail the above questions you**

have addressed in the article. With your suggested assistance, we have made modifications to the introduction section on Lines 34-56 as indicated by the Aqua blue & yellow highlight.

6. In the results, it is not written how many cases of hospitalized patients there were in these 4 years. In fact, it is not clear that 84 patients are suffering from pancreatitis, what percentage of all hospitalized patients in this geographical area?

    - **Thank you very much for your suggestions. We apologize for not clarifying in detail the above questions you have addressed in the article. I have made the changes on Lines 78-79 and 281 table 1 as indicated by the Aqua blue highlight.**
    - **Since the total number of hospitalized patients was obtained from the HIS system, there is a possibility that the presented percentage may not be entirely accurate. This is due to the retrospective nature of the study and the absence of registration for some cases in previous years.**

    Also, this percentage of hospitalization should be compared with other regions of Iran and other parts of the world. I think, you need more evaluated in similar studies.

    - **Thanks very much for your meaningful comments. I have made the changes in discussion section on Lines 116-122 as indicated by the Aqua blue highlight. I need to clarify that the meta-analyses conducted in Iran have also focused on the global statistics of pancreatitis.**

7. In discussion, Lines 91-103 should have been moved in the introduction

- **Thanks very much for your meaningful comments. I have made the changes in discussion section**

8. The discussion is very well. However, write the limitations at the end.
    - **Thanks very much for your meaningful comments. I have made the changes at the end of manuscript on Lines 189-1193 as indicated by the Aqua blue highlight.**
9. After making the corrections, the entire manuscript should be reviewed for typographical errors.
    - **Thanks very much for your meaningful comments. I have made the changes in manuscript**

We thank the editors and reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. We hope that the revised manuscript has adequately addressed the editor's and reviewers' concerns and is accepted for publication. We look forward to hearing from you regarding the suitability of the manuscript for publication in the Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care.

Sincerely

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 16 Jun 2024 – 16 Jun 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 16 Jun 2024

Dear Author,
This manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 16 Jun 2024

Dear Author,
This manuscript has been revised and is acceptable for publication in this version.
Thank you