Nephro-Urology Monthly
Volume 16 · Issue 2 · e139841

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Platelet Indices in Children with Nephrotic Syndrome

Simin Sadeghi-Bojd, Alireza Teimouri, Elham Zarifi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
11 Aug 2023	27 Mar 2024	27 Apr 2024	10.5812/numonthly-139841

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** Peyman Kheirandish Zarandi, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8
4 **Revision 3** 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

2 comments · 8 Sep 2023 – 15 Sep 2023

Peyman Kheirandish Zarandi Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 8 Sep 2023

1. The main point about the manuscript is "poor writing" in English. There are several spelling and grammatical errors within the manuscript, which need to be corrected in the right order. Please consider the English quality of the manuscript again and revise it accordingly. A careful revision of the English language is recommended. I suggest revision by a professional language editing service to improve both grammar and readability.
2. Please make the fonts and spacing between words consistent in some parts of the manuscript.
3. Please check your keywords against the Mesh database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions.
4. What is the difference between your work and that of Chioma L. Odimegwu (https://doi.org/10.1186/s12882-022-02894-5)?
5. The novelty of your work must be discussed; it seems to be very weak.
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. It is better to use a schematic diagram to show the study and group divisions to make them easier for the reader to understand.
8. First, you must present the demographic variables (like sex, age, and others) and confounding factors in a table for each group, then compare them, and then proceed to the final result.
9. The statistical analysis and the selected test are not compatible with the data set. For example, the Chi-square test (table1) is used for qualitative-nominal data.
10. The table captions are not perfect. They should be more informative, with more details, including statistical methods.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 15 Sep 2023

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.

Reviewers' Comments

1. The main point about the manuscript is "poor writing" in English. There are several spelling and grammatical errors within the manuscript, which need to be revised in the right order. Please consider the English quality of the manuscript again and revise it accordingly. A careful revision of the English language is recommended. I suggest a revision by a professional language editing service to both improve grammar and readability. *Assessed and paraphrased considering grammar.*

2. Please match the fonts and spaces between words in some parts of the manuscript. *Considered*
3. Please check your Keywords with the Mesh database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions. *Checked*
4. What is the difference between your work with Chioma L. Odimegwu (https://doi.org/10.1186/s12882-022-02894-5)? *The results of this study reported and compared with our results.*
5. The novelty of your work must be discussed, it seems it is so weak. *Considered*
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. *Considered*
7. It is better to use a schematic diagram to show the study and group divisions for easy understanding for the reader. *Considered*
8. At first you must present the demographic variables (like sex and age and others) and confounding factors in a table according to each group and then compare it then go to the final result. *Considered*
9. The statistical analysis and the selected test is not compatible with the data set. for example Chi-square test (table1) is used for qualitative-nominal data. *In this table, because the variables had free distribution,* The Kruskal–Wallis test used and the test value namely is Chi-Square.

10. The table captions are not perfect. they should be more informative with more details including statistical methods. *Changed*

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 27 Oct 2023 – 30 Oct 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 27 Oct 2023

1- The English in the manuscript has not been revised.
2- The manuscript needs spelling and grammar corrections (for example, in lines 26, 27, 35, 37, 57, 65, 91, 102, 172, 182, 209, 218, 219, 227, 234, 239, ...).

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 30 Oct 2023

Dear Dr Teimouri,
Your manuscript, "Platelet Indices in children with Nephrotic Syndrome," has now been assessed.

We invite you to revise your paper. When your revision is ready, please submit the updated manuscript and a point-by-point response if applicable.

Kind regards,

Mohammad Heiat
Associate Editor
Nephro-Urology Monthly

In order to process your paper (please note that if there are review reports, these will be included below), we require:

• A point-by-point response to the comments, including a description of any additional experiments that were carried out and a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with.

This must be uploaded as a 'Point-by-point response' file. All changes to the manuscript must be highlighted or indicated by using tracked changes.

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.

Dear Reviewer

Hello and good time.

According to the last comments about the English edition, we paraphrased whole text line by line considering grammar.

Best wishes

Alireza Teimouri

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

4

Revision 3

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.

Respected reviewer.

Salam

Based on the comments issued from your side, I did correction on two comments of;

1- The type of the study changed as case-control
2- The term of P?Cr changed as P/Cr
3- Figure citation corrected in the text

In addition for more confirmation, one more time the text was read and a little grammatical changes done.

Regards

4 Revision 3

0 comments

No public comments in this round.