Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

Manuscript NO: 62241

Title: Health staff as promoters of parental presence at anesthetic induction: Net Promoter Score survey

Reviewer's code: 04105454

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-11 10:36

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-11 10:46

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is well written paper yet it is hardly to be implemented

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

Manuscript NO: 62241

Title: Health staff as promoters of parental presence at anesthetic induction: Net Promoter Score survey

Reviewer's code: 05278137
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MD
Professional title: Doctor
Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy
Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-10
Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan
Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-13 10:28
Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-17 11:21
Review time: 4 Days

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The goal of the qualitative research is to collect informations to develop a deep understanding of a topic from an individual perspective. Qualitative research is explorative, does not formulate hypothesis, and is not able to test them. No conclusion comes from qualitative research. Qualitative research requires a less structured research methodology. However, it is always necessary to be carefully in reporting all the data. Moreover, to better understand gathering data (respondents agreement/satisfaction) researchers must clearly define the meaning of terms used. Based on the above, the Authors should review several points: - Specify the terms: outpatient/inpatient surgeries and major outpatient surgery - With regard to the 57 patients of the first pilot phase, there is a complete lack of data on: what was their age? were there patients with cognitive disabilities? were they premedicated? how many of them and with which drugs? Perhaps these factors could have affected respondents - In the 'discussion' the authors report on the impact of preoperative family preparation and PPIA, which are considered distinct strategies. However, in the study methods, if the authors propose only the PPIA or any other type of preoperative family preparation to parents, it is not sufficiently clear. In my opinion, it needs to be explained better in 'materials and methods'. -Define more appropriately (even with some examples) the survey terms: surgical experience, patient safety, surgical efficiency - In the description of the NPS: 'For each item it uses a score from 0 to 10 where 0 is very unlikely to be recommended and 10 is strongly recommended. After obtaining the scores, those between 9-10 are classified as promoters, between 7-8 are passive and < or equal to 6 are retractors'. I propose to start this sentence with: Generally or In the original version of the score…. -

In the 'results' check the % of respondents and their sum, also check correspondence with the Figure 1 - The 'results' do not show how many scores of 3 on the Likert scale

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

were recorded - Edit 'limitations': at present they are insufficient - Edit the 'conclusion' on the basis of the above introduction

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

Manuscript NO: 62241

Title: Health staff as promoters of parental presence at anesthetic induction: Net Promoter Score survey

Reviewer's code: 00735414

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-23 22:03

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-24 17:36

Review time: 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the manuscript: "Health staff as promoters of parental presence at anesthetic induction: Net Promoter Score survey" the authors have evaluated the statements of participants in perioperative care of children undergoing procedures under general anesthesia in the presence of parents at anesthesia induction. With minor language polishing that is needed, there are several points to be corrected in the manuscript. Statistical analysis is unclear and must be re-done. The authors have reported that respondents rated their impression at 1-5 for each statement in the survey. However, it is unclear why and how the authors then calculated it from 0-10. And how and why they expressed those numbers in a negative value. It seems more logical that they calculated mean values with standard deviation from numbers that were obtained by the survey (1-5). After that, a score for each question and group should be expressed as the mean of all respondents. This way it is not clear what was done with the moderately positive (passive). By type of answer, they partially agree with the statement. Are they and why were they rejected from the analysis? Why are moderately negative placed in the same group with extremely negative ones. I suggest again, to calculate the mean for each question. If the total score is in the scale between strongly agree (5), neither agree nor disagree (3) or strongly disagree (1), just show it that way. It's not necessary for this analysis to convert continuous or ordinary variables into nominal. The use of words Promoters- Retractors suggests that two groups of participants were analyzed – who are generally PRO and another group who are generally CON. As these are the same respondents, the use of these terms does not seem justified. Probably each of them agrees with some statements and disagrees with others to some extent. Authors have stated that epigastric herniorraphy, umbilical herniorraphy, inguinal herniorraphy, circumcision, hydroceletomy, orchidopexy and other minor surgical procedures under

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

general anesthesia were done in their institution. Nothing was measured and reported regarding outcomes (total operative and anesthesia time, anesthesia, complications), and therefore authors cannot argue that "no related adverse effects were found in our or other studies" because they did not investigate adverse events, but opinions. Before considering this article as acceptable for publication, and giving any recommendation, these issues must be corrected.

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

Manuscript NO: 62241

Title: Health staff as promoters of parental presence at anesthetic induction: Net Promoter Score survey

Reviewer's code: 00735414

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-10 19:29

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-27 03:04

Review time: 16 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

I have seen a revision made by the authors based on the comments of the reviewers. Some parts of the manuscript have been corrected, so that part of the text is fine. For part of the definitions for the terms they used (promoters - retractors), they decided to keep their own terminology, it is their right to decide so. This confuses readers a little, but again it is their right to decide so. After corrections, the paper is acceptable for publication, and the grade for this paper A-E is good (C)