Nephro-Urology Monthly
Volume 15 · Issue 3 · e139640

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Connection Between Tantrums and Voiding Dysfunction in Children: A Case-control Study

Zahra Mohamadi, Fakhreddin Shariatmadari, Farideh Ranjbaran, Parsa Yousefichaijan, Pegah Mohaghegh, Mohammadreza Rezaie, Salehesadat Hosseini, Amin Tajerian

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
2 Aug 2023	28 Aug 2023	16 Sep 2023	10.5812/numonthly-139640

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 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

2 comments · 25 Aug 2023 – 26 Aug 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Aug 2023

1. Please consider the English quality of the manuscript again and revise it accordingly.
2. Please check your keywords against the MeSH database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions.
3. Please mention the weak and strong points of your study.
4. Please write about the limitations of your survey. Are there any limitations to this study? If yes, please mention all limitations of the current study within the discussion section, too.
5. It is better to use a schematic diagram to show the study and group divisions for easy understanding by the reader.
6. According to the inclusion and exclusion criteria (not included in the study), how many subjects were included, and how many were excluded? Please mention this in the main text.
7. You could increase the number of more recent studies in the reference section. You should have comprehensive and reliable comparisons between your findings and those of the other previous studies.
8. Some sentences are repeated exactly in different parts of the article, which is very boring for the reader. The article should be better organized.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 26 Aug 2023

Minor 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.

Rebuttal Letter

Nephro-Urology Monthly

139640 - REV 1

27 August 2023

Dear Dr. Behzad Einollahi, Dr. Mohammad Heiat, and Reviewers,

I hope this message finds you well.

First and foremost, our team would like to express our gratitude for your detailed and constructive feedback regarding our manuscript. Your insights have been instrumental in improving the quality and rigor of our work.

In response to your feedback, we have refined the manuscript's English for clarity, updated keywords using the Mesh database, highlighted our study's strengths and weaknesses, and detailed its limitations, both generally and within the discussion. A schematic diagram now elucidates the study's divisions, and we've clarified participant inclusion and exclusion in the main text. Furthermore, we've enriched our reference section with recent studies and restructured the article to remove redundancy, aiming for a more engaging read.

We trust that with these revisions, our manuscript now aligns more closely with the standards of Nephro-Urology Monthly. We genuinely value your guidance in this process.

Sincerely,

A.T.,

On behalf of all authors.

Reviewer #1 Comments:

C-1. Please consider the English quality of the manuscript again and revise it accordingly.

A-1. Certainly, we have given rigorous attention to the English quality of the manuscript. We used the Grammarly tool to evaluate and further refine the language after revision. The manuscript scored a 99 out of 100 on Grammarly, which indicates that it is almost entirely free of grammatical, punctuation, and stylistic errors. This high score ensures that the document adheres to professional and academic writing standards, making it clear and easy to understand for readers. Grammarly report is attached to submission revision.

C-2. Please check your Keywords with the Mesh database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions.

A-2. keywords are now selected from automatic list based on mesh terms:

Anger: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/68000786

Child: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/68002648

Child Rearing: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Child+Rearing

Psychology, Child: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Psychology%2C+Child

Urination Disorders: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/?term=Urination+Disorders

---

C-3. Please mention the weak and strong points of your study.

A-3. This section was added and discussed in the limitations section.

C-4. Please write about the limitations of your survey. Are there any limitations to this study? If yes, please mention all limitations of the current study within the discussion section, too.

A-4. We have acknowledged the limitations of our study, including potential biases from parental questionnaires, the case-control design's inability to confirm causation, and the study's restricted cultural and age scope. These have been detailed within the discussion section for a comprehensive understanding.

> C-5. It is better to use a schematic diagram to show the study and group divisions for easy understanding for the reader.

A-5. Figure 1 was added to satisfy this criterion.

> C-6. According to inclusion and exclusion criteria (not included in the study), how many subjects were included, and how many were excluded? Please mention this in the main text.

A-6. final excluded and included participants were discussed in results (lines 95-97).

> C-7. You could increase the number of more recent studies in the reference section. You should have comprehensive and reliable comparisons between your findings with the other previous studies..

A-7. Thank you for your feedback on the reference section. We acknowledge the importance of comparing our findings with recent studies to provide a comprehensive and reliable perspective.

It's worth noting that our research is situated within a niche and emerging area of study. As a result, there has been limited examination of this particular subject in the academic community. Our literature search was exhaustive, and we aimed to include all relevant studies to provide context and comparisons for our findings. However, given the nascent state of this field, there is a dearth of recent studies available.

We genuinely value comprehensive research and if there are any specific studies or sources that we may have missed, or if any new research emerges in the future, we are more than

eager to review them and incorporate relevant findings into our work.

We appreciate your understanding and are open to further suggestions or references that you believe would enhance the quality of our research.

C-8. Some sentences are repeated exactly in different parts of the article, which is very boring for the reader. The article should be better organized.

A-8. We have taken care to eliminate repetitive sentences, ensuring the article is organized in a manner that is engaging for the reader.

Associate Editor's Comments:

C-1. Minor Revision.

A-1. Done

EIC's Comments:

C-1. It requires a minor revision.

A-1. Done

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 8 Sep 2023 – 15 Sep 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 8 Sep 2023

The revision is satisfactory.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 15 Sep 2023

Accept