

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

This paper was submitted to a another journal from Archives of Disease in Childhood but declined for publication following peer review. The authors addressed the reviewers' comments and submitted the revised paper to BMJ Paediatrics Open. The paper was subsequently accepted for publication at BMJ Paediatrics Open.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Maternal attitude towards delaying puberty in girls with and without disability; a questionnaire-based study from the United Arab Emirates
AUTHORS	Deeb, Asma; Akle, Mariette; Al Zaabi, Abrar; Siwji, Zohra; Attia, Salima; Al Suwaidi, Hana; Al Qahtani, Nabras; Ehtisham, Sarah

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Dr Gareth Lewis Institution and Country: North Middlesex Univerisity Hospital, Sterling Way, Edmonton. London, N18 1QX Competing interests: Nil
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an useful insight into the dilemma's facing parents in this position, and some of the ways in which children with disability may present with menarche and some of the anxieties surrounding development at this stage of life. However I think it needs revision for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The document's language and structure needs someone to proof read it to correct some basic English errors in structure of sentences and conjunctions</p> <p>1) The phraseology of the paper needs alteration. In particular, referring to the study participants without disability as 'normal' I think would be more appropriate if they were labeled 'without disability'</p> <p>2) They list no limitations of the study in terms of it's insights and where future studies could give further information. It would have been a lot more revealing in terms of parental attitudes to this issue if some qualitative interviews and analysis had been performed rather than just a quantitative questionnaire and I think they need to explicitly state that this methodology would have been a more valid means of studying this question.</p> <p>3) Addressing why only mothers and not father's were interviewed would also provide greater completeness in terms of explaining the thoughts behind their methodology - I can speculate that this was due to cultural reasons or that fathers were not felt to be most appropriate to ask about the decisions in question, but again this is an important point to address within the paper.</p>
-------------------------	--

	4) The document's language and structure needs someone to proof read it to correct some English errors in structure of sentences and conjunctions
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1 (Dr Gareth Lewis)

Comments to the Authors:

This is a useful insight into the dilemma's facing parents in this position, and some of the ways in which children with disability may present with menarche and some of the anxieties surrounding development at this stage of life. However, I think it needs revision for the following reasons:

1) The document's language and structure needs someone to proof read it to correct some basic English errors in structure of sentences and conjunctions.

Answer

The language and grammar have been amended throughout.

1) The phraseology of the paper needs alteration. In particular, referring to the study participants without disability as 'normal'. I think it would be more appropriate if they were labeled 'without disability'.

Answer

The manuscript has been revised as suggested. The study participants have been subdivided into 2 groups for clarity. The term 'without disability' replaced 'normal'.

2) They list no limitations of the study in terms of its insights and where future studies could give further information. It would have been a lot more revealing in terms of parental attitudes to this issue if some qualitative interviews and analysis had been performed rather than just a quantitative questionnaire and I think they need to explicitly state that this methodology would have been a more valid means of studying this question.

Answer

A paragraph highlighting study limitation is added.

3) Addressing why only mothers and not fathers were interviewed would also provide greater completeness in terms of explaining the thoughts behind their methodology - I can speculate that this was due to cultural reasons or that fathers were not felt to be most appropriate to ask about the decisions in question, but again this is an important point to address within the paper.

Answer

This point was addressed, and the below paragraph was added in the introduction.

"In the United Arab Emirate and some other Arab and Asian countries, mothers are the main carers of girls with disability and are more commonly involved in hospital visits and treatment decisions than fathers (personal observation)".

4) The document's language and structure needs someone to proof read it to correct some English errors in structure of sentences and conjunctions.

Answer

The manuscript has been carefully proof-read and the language and grammar has been corrected throughout.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Bronia Arnott Institution and Country: Newcastle University, UK Competing interests: None
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Aug-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This manuscript is much improved with the revision. The authors have addressed issues relating to the language and grammar and used more appropriate terminology. They have added a limitation section to the discussion, highlighting the limitations as requested by reviewers. They have included additional information which improves the clarity of the manuscript. I would suggest the following further refinements:</p> <p>Title Could the authors please highlight the cultural/geographical context in which this study occurs in the title (for example, say 'in the United Arab Emirates').</p> <p>Introduction While the authors have highlighted their choice of method and sample size as a limitation in the discussion section, there needs to be some further justification of their choices earlier in the paper. While they now offer a rationale for the study in the revision and state that no formal sample size calculation was performed they do not justify the reason for the specific chosen method, retrospective quantitative study, or why they have not continued to collect data until they had a larger sample size. If the reason is that this is an exploratory study then this should be highlighted in the introduction.</p> <p>Results There is some inconsistency in the results section. Initially it is stated that 25 (92.5%) of group B stated that hygiene management was important (which is presented in the table), however later the manuscript refers to 23 (85%) of group B. Could this discrepancy be corrected.</p> <p>Discussion The authors state in the limitation section that a qualitative study with a larger cohort would be preferable, however a qualitative study would not necessarily require a larger sample but would be informed by data saturation. A further quantitative study would require a larger sample size. The authors should make clear that future options would be a qualitative study or a larger quantitative study.</p> <p>Tables In table 2 the ranking of frequency of choice of reasons for group B does not seem to be accurate. The first reason seems to be labelled as frequency 1, but the second seems to be labelled as frequency 3 and so on. Could the authors check this please and amend as necessary.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

This manuscript is much improved with the revision. The authors have addressed issues relating to the language and grammar and used more appropriate terminology. They have added a limitation section to the discussion, highlighting the limitations as requested by reviewers.

They have included additional information which improves the clarity of the manuscript. I would suggest the following further refinements:

Title

Could the authors please highlight the cultural/geographical context in which this study occurs in the title (for example, say 'in the United Arab Emirates').

Answer:

Title is amended as suggested.

Introduction

While the authors have highlighted their choice of method and sample size as a limitation in the discussion section, there needs to be some further justification of their choices earlier in the paper. While they now offer a rationale for the study in the revision and state that no formal sample size calculation was performed they do not justify the reason for the specific chosen method, retrospective quantitative study, or why they have not continued to collect data until they had a larger sample size. If the reason is that this is an exploratory study then this should be highlighted in the introduction.

Answer:

All eligible girls in the clinic database were approached. This comment was added in the method section.

Results

There is some inconsistency in the results section. Initially it is stated that 25 (92.5%) of group B stated that hygiene management was important (which is presented in the table), however later the manuscript refers to 23 (85%) of group B. Could this discrepancy be corrected.

Answer:

The error is corrected.

Discussion

The authors state in the limitation section that a qualitative study with a larger cohort would be preferable, however a qualitative study would not necessarily require a larger sample but would be informed by data saturation. A further quantitative study would require a larger sample size. The authors should make clear that future options would be a qualitative study or a larger quantitative study.

Answer:

The statement is corrected indicating that the limitation is related to the small sample size.

Tables

In table 2 the ranking of frequency of choice of reasons for group B does not seem to be accurate. The first reason seems to be labelled as frequency 1, but the second seems to be labelled as frequency 3 and so on. Could the authors check this please and amend as necessary.

Answer

Error in table 2 is amended

VERSION 3 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Bronia Arnott Institution and Country: Newcastle University Competing interests: None
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Sep-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	There is a grammatical error in one of the sentences that the authors have added on page 30 as a response to the previous review. If this error is corrected I am happy for the manuscript to be accepted for publication.
-------------------------	--