

# Review of: "The Outcome of Emergency Admissions and Associated Factors Among Children Admitted to the Pediatric Emergency Unit at Selected Public Hospitals at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia — Retrospective Cross-Sectional Study"

Berhanu Beri

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- General concept of the article was good and timely with certain corrections

## Specific comments and questions

### 1. Under abstract

Line 10: You describe children as having less than 24 hours admission = 53.8%; this result is not cross-matched with under result points

A) 4.4. Clinical management and length of stay (line 4) – length of stay 53.8% or

B) Table 2: <24 hours stay =  $119/303 \times 100\% = 39.3\%$  (line 20)

### 2. Under introduction (Figure 1: Conceptual framework)

What are those common interventions given that are not presented in the result parts, but are placed on your conceptual framework?

### 3. Under objective

List your specific objectives because whether you meet your objectives or not is not clear

### 4. Under methodology

A) This study was previously conducted at Tikur Anbesa specialized hospital. Why do you need to repeat this study? And what are your selection criteria for those four public hospitals from the 13 public hospitals to be involved in the study? (study setting)

B) Draw the STROBE flow charts for the study and study population, including statistical analysis, inclusion and exclusion criteria

C) What is your sampling technique that you used in order to select and incorporate 303 PED charts from those four public hospitals?

### 5. Under result part

i) Table 1: The derangement of SPO<sub>2</sub> was 91 (30%), but what do 169 (55.8%) indicate?

ii) Figure 2: Pneumonia frequency in figure 22.4%, but in the text 21.4% is not cross-matched; also, on the figure, the decimal value is placed by a comma, but it should be by a full stop, and the combination value of TB, anemia, hepatitis, and fracture should be added to figure 2 as others

iii) Figure 3: Since this study is retrospective cross-sectional, were the final outcomes documented for those children admitted to wards or ICUs (47.5%, n=144)

iv) 4.3. Organ system involvement and major causes- place values like:

35.3% respiratory system involvement

25.4% GI involvement as depicted in figure 2, but not

12% CVS involvement cross-matched with figure 2

v) Table 2: Line 3, in the text, it says 87.5% children received IV fluid and left alive at the emergency department, but in table 2; IV fluid received children were 135 (44.6%) alive. How do you see this discrepancy?

#### 6. Under discussion

A) For comorbidity as associated factor, discuss AOR rather than COR, because you have discussed crude death rate from all mortality

B) Discuss associated factors for comorbidity and fluid treatment by placing the results of all and compare with the current study. For example, place the results obtained from USA, Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania

#### 7. Under conclusion

You have 3 associated factors which have significant association ( $p < 0.05$ ), but you conclude only 2; please incorporate the left associated factor

#### 8. Under references

- Certain references were not fully cited