Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 14 · Issue 2 · e149149

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Complications of Therapeutic Plasma Exchange in Patients with Neurologic Disorders

Fatemeh Ganjiani, Siamak Abdi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
28 May 2024	16 Nov 2024	26 Jan 2025	10.5812/jjcdc-149149

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** Mehrnaz Ahmadi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Mehrnaz Ahmadi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 9

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

Authors' reply to reviewers 11

Reviewer and editor comments 13

1 Original submission

3 comments · 1 Aug 2024 – 22 Sep 2024

Mehrnaz Ahmadi Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 1 Aug 2024

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This manuscript is valuable but needs correction in various parts.
Abstract
1. What were the components of the data collection form?
2. How did you evaluate the level of anxiety of the patients? It is not clear in the abstract.
Introduction
1. You need to describe what is known about the issue based on current literature.
2. You need to state what the gap in the literature is and how this study helps to fill the knowledge gap.
Method
1. The method of data collection is not described. By whom and how were the data collected?
2. How did you evaluate the patients' anxiety? This is not described in the method.
3. What information was completed by the patients and what information was completed by the researcher?
4. For how many hours was the patient monitored to detect complications? How was this step done?
5. How did you check the rate of infection?
6. How were cardiac complications investigated? What side effects did you have in mind?
7. Did you not check shock as a complication?
Results
1. It is not customary to report a P value of 0.000; you should write $P < 0.001$.
Discussion
1. There should be an Implications section that draws upon the study findings and specifies what your study has added to science.
References
1. The references are very old. At least 50% of the references should be related to the last 5 years.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 22 Sep 2024

Dear author,
Your manuscript needs some revision in all sections. Please revise and resubmit.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 22 Sep 2024

Dear Author,
Please accept our apologies for our delay in reviewing your manuscript. The delay occurred because the reviewers did not respond to our request. We now provide comments on your manuscript. Please revise and resubmit.

This manuscript addresses a significant issue in clinical practice regarding the complications of TPE in neurological disorders. However, it requires substantial revisions to improve clarity, methodological rigor,

and overall presentation. Addressing these comments will enhance the manuscript's contribution to the field and its suitability for publication.

Abstract:
The abstract should clearly define the objective, methods, results, and conclusions concisely. Currently, it is somewhat verbose and lacks a clear summary of key findings.

Introduction:
The introduction provides a good background but could benefit from a more structured approach. A concise statement of the research question and hypotheses would enhance clarity.
References to previous studies should be more clearly integrated to highlight gaps in the literature that this study aims to address.

Methods:
Sample Size Justification: The manuscript does not provide a rationale for the sample size of 95 patients. A power analysis should be included to justify this number.
Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria: While some criteria are mentioned, the rationale for excluding certain patients (e.g., severe underlying conditions) should be more explicitly stated to justify the study population.
Data Collection: Details regarding the data acquisition form and how complications were assessed should be more thoroughly explained. For example, were complications self-reported or clinician-verified?

Results:
The results section is detailed but could be better organized. Consider using subsections for clarity, such as demographics, complications, and statistical comparisons.
Table Presentation: Tables should be referenced in the text and discussed in detail. For example, Table 2 should include a brief interpretation of the findings rather than simply presenting raw data.

Discussion:
The discussion is comprehensive but could be more focused. It should explicitly relate findings to the research question and hypothesis.
Comparison with Literature: While comparisons with existing literature are made, the manuscript should critically evaluate discrepancies and possible reasons for differences in complication rates.
Limitations: The limitations section is underdeveloped. It should explicitly address potential biases, the impact of the small sample size, and the lack of a control group.

Conclusions:
The conclusions should summarize the main findings and their clinical implications more succinctly. They should also suggest directions for future research based on the findings.

References:
Ensure that all references are current and relevant. Some cited studies are outdated, and newer studies should be included to provide a comprehensive background.

Formatting and Language:
The manuscript should be carefully proofread for grammatical errors and formatting inconsistencies. Clear and precise language will enhance readability.
Please mark all changes in your revision and provide a letter that shows where all revisions were made.

Thank you.

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 editor, thank you for your review of this manuscript. We revise the manuscript according to the reviewer comments and all changes red and highlight

Reviewer 1:
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This manuscript is valuable but needs correction in various parts.
Abstract
1. What were the components of the data collection form?

Answer: we rewrite the abstract section.
2. How did you evaluate the level of anxiety of the patients? It is not clear in the abstract.

Answer: we rewrite the abstract section.
Introduction
1. Need to describe what is known about the issue based on current literature.

Answer: dear reviewer, we added some study in the introduction section.
2. Need to state what the gap in the literature is and how this study helps to fill the knowledge gap.

Answer: we added a paragraph in the last of introduction section.
Method
1. The method of data collection is not described. By whom and how was the data collected?

Answer: dear we added some sentences to the method section.
2. How did you evaluate the patients' anxiety? Not described in the method.

Answer: dear we added some sentences to the method section.
3. What information was completed by the patients and what information was completed by the researcher?

Answer: dear we added some sentences to the method section.
4. How many hours was the patient monitored to detect complications? How was this step done?

Answer: dear we added some sentences to the method section. Also, the complication evaluated in 1 and 5 days after TPE.
5. How did you check the rate of infection?

Answer: dear we added some sentences to the method section.
6. How were cardiac complications investigated? What side effects did you have in mind?

Answer: dear we added some sentences to the method section.
7. Did you not check shock as a complication?

Answer: dear we added some sentences to the method section.
Results
1. It is not customary to report a P value of 0.000, you should write P < 0.001.

Answer: we corrected it.

Discussion

1. There should be an Implications section that draws upon the study findings and specify what your study has added to science.

Answer:

References

1. The references are very old. At least 50% of the references should be related to the last 5 years.

Answer: we reconsider all references and replace with new references

Associate Editor 1:
Dear author,
YOur manuscript need some revsion in all section. please revise and resubmit.
Thank you

EIC Decision:

Dear Author,
Please accept our apologies for our delay in review. It was because of the reviewers' response and they didn't respond to our request. At this moment we provide comments about your manuscript. please revise and resubmit.

This manuscript addresses a significant issue in clinical practice regarding the complications of TPE in neurological disorders. However, it requires substantial revisions to improve clarity, methodological rigor, and overall presentation. Addressing these comments will enhance the manuscript's contribution to the field and its suitability for publication.

Abstract:
should clearly define the objective, methods, results, and conclusions concisely. Currently, it is somewhat verbose and lacks a clear summary of key findings.

Answer: we rewrite the abstract section.

Introduction:
The introduction provides a good background but could benefit from a more structured approach. A concise statement of the research question and hypotheses would enhance clarity.
References to previous studies should be more clearly integrated to highlight gaps in the literature that this study aims to address.

Answer: dear editor, we added some sentences to the introduction section.

Methods:
Sample Size Justification: The manuscript does not provide a rationale for the sample size of 95 patients. A power analysis should be included to justify this number.

Answer: we did it.
Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria: While some criteria are mentioned, the rationale for excluding

certain patients (e.g., severe underlying conditions) should be more explicitly stated to justify the study population.

Answer: we did it.
Data Collection: Details regarding the data acquisition form and how complications were assessed should be more thoroughly explained. For example, were complications self-reported or clinician-verified?

Answer: dear, we related for your comment, we added some sentences to the method section.

Results:
The results section is detailed but could be better organized. Consider using subsections for clarity, such as demographics, complications, and statistical comparisons.

Answer: we corrected it.
Table Presentation: Tables should be referenced in the text and discussed in detail. For example, Table 2 should include a brief interpretation of the findings rather than simply presenting raw data.

Answer: we did it.

Discussion:
The discussion is comprehensive but could be more focused. It should explicitly relate findings to the research question and hypothesis.

Answer: we rewrite the discussion section.
Comparison with Literature: While comparisons with existing literature are made, the manuscript should critically evaluate discrepancies and possible reasons for differences in complication rates.

Answer: we rewrite the discussion section.
Limitations: The limitations section is underdeveloped. It should explicitly address potential biases, the impact of the small sample size, and the lack of a control group.

Answer: we added limitation section to the main text.

Conclusions:
The conclusions should summarize the main findings and their clinical implications more succinctly. It should also suggest directions for future research based on the findings.

Answer: we rewrite the conclusion section.

References:
Ensure that all references are current and relevant. Some cited studies are outdated, and newer studies should be included to provide a comprehensive background.

Answer:

Formatting and Language:
The manuscript should be carefully proofread for grammatical errors and formatting inconsistencies. Clear and precise language will enhance readability.

Answer: the manuscript recheck by native speaker English.
Please mark all changes in your revision and provide a letter that shows all revisions where are made.

Answer: we conducted all changes in the manuscript according to the reviewer comments and upload a file with response to reviewer name in the online system.

Thank you.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 9 Oct 2024 – 29 Oct 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

REJECT 9 Oct 2024

Greetings,
The abstract is not well written, and the results are not presented scientifically. The problem statement lacks coherence, and previous research has not been presented. The innovation and novelty of the research are unclear. The procedures, evaluation indicators, and measurement methods are unclear. The procedures and data collection methods are not well described. The findings are not well presented. The tables do not follow the journal's format. The discussion is poorly written, and the results have not been adequately compared with other findings. The limitations should be methodological. Given these major shortcomings, the manuscript does not merit publication.

Mehrnaz Ahmadi Reviewer

ACCEPT 20 Oct 2024

Congratulations to the authors. My concerns have been addressed and the manuscript has been greatly improved.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 28 Oct 2024

Dear Author:
1- Add the footnote section to the end of the article. See the most recently published articles.
2- In the Discussion section, indicate the applications of the findings.
3- The sampling method has not been explained.
4- Explain the data collection instrument.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 29 Oct 2024

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs some revision in all sections. Please revise and resubmit.
Thanks

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.

Reviewer 1:Greetings. The abstract section is not well written, and the results are not presented scientifically.

Answer: Respected reviewer, the abstract was rewritten.

The problem statement lacks coherence, and previous studies are not presented. The innovation and novelty of the study are not clear.

Answer: Respected reviewer, previous studies and the innovation of the article are presented in the last part of the introduction. Also, the coherence of the introduction is appropriate, and each paragraph is in line with the previous and next paragraphs.

The method of implementation, the evaluation indices and the method of measurement are not clear. The method of implementation and the way of data collection are not well described.

Answer: Respected reviewer, thank you very much for your comment. Since the study was retrospective, the data were collected on the basis of a checklist that had been prepared in advance. Accordingly, the data were collected from the patients' records.

The findings are not presented well. The tables are not presented according to the journal's format.

Answer: Respected reviewer, the results section has been arranged in accordance with the data and similarly to other articles. Also, all tables have been arranged according to the journal's instructions.

The discussion is poorly written and is not well compared with other results.

Answer: Respected reviewer, the results of the study have been compared with other similar studies. Also, the agreement or disagreement of the results with the present study has been discussed.

The limitations should be methodological. Given these important flaws, it is not worth publishing.

Answer: The limitations of the study have been added to the last part of the discussion.

Reviewer 2:
Congratulations to the authors. My concerns have been addressed and the manuscript has been greatly improved.

Answer: thank you.

Associate Editor 1:Dear author:1- The footnote section should be added to the end of the article. See the latest published articles.

Answer: Respected reviewer, it was applied. 2- In the discussion section, the applications of the findings should be mentioned.

Answer: Respected reviewer, it was applied.3-The sampling method has not been explained.

Answer: Respected reviewer, it was applied.4-Explain the data collection tool.

Answer: Respected reviewer, it was applied.

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 26 Jan 2025 – 26 Jan 2025

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 26 Jan 2025

All corrections are accepted.
Thank you.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 26 Jan 2025

Dear Author,
This manuscript in the current version is acceptable.
Thank you