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"STATISTICAL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT:

Is the study design appropriate for the research question (considering whether the analyzed population accurately reflects the design and whether you see any problems with control/comparison groups, e.g., likely confounders)?

Yes - overall design, population, and control groups are appropriate

Are methodologies adequate and well implemented (considering whether assumptions are addressed and whether analyses are robust)?

No - there are minor issues

Are the analyses adequately communicated (considering whether reporting details are adequate and whether figures and tables are well labeled and described)?

No - there are minor issues

Does the interpretation accurately reflect the analyses without overstatement (considering whether limitations/bias are acknowledged and whether accurate descriptors, e.g., 'significant', are used)?

Yes - interpretation accurately reflects analyses, limitations/bias are acknowledged, accurate descriptors are used

Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a statistically sound contribution?

Probably - with minor revisions

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

In this study, epidemiological evaluation of primary NS and secondary NS patients was performed. In this context, the duration of hospital stay and the complications seen in related individuals were examined. Comparisons were made in terms of hospitalization periods.
The t-test and one-way ANOVA were used but the reasons for the use of the statistical methods used were not clearly specified. There are some errors in the representation of the results instead of the table with the representation of the graph only preferred.

If revisions are made after revision, the article can be accepted.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
In the statistical method section, the T-tests expression should be changed to t-tests. Which test was used in pairwise comparisons when there was a significant difference in the One-way ANOVA result? How was the use of parametric tests such as t-test and one-way ANOVA? Were all the variables have normally distribution in each subgroup? What is the statistical power of the study? The study population expression should be changed to study sample. When the result section is examined, it is seen that comparisons are made according to many criteria in terms of average length of stay. In addition, the comparison of the average length of stay between age groups and infection types is only graphically expressed. It is important to summarize the comparisons made in terms of average length of stay (according to Complications of NS and demographical features) in a single table in terms of the clarity of the study.

The expression in the total column (100.0%) can be removed in Table 2

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
In the statistical method section, the T-tests expression should be changed to t-tests. Which test was used in pairwise comparisons when there was a significant difference in the One-way ANOVA result? How was the use of parametric tests such as t-test and one-way ANOVA? Were all the variables have normally distribution in each subgroup? What is the statistical power of the study? The study population expression should be changed to study sample. When the result section is examined, it is seen that comparisons are made according to many criteria in terms of average length of stay. In addition, the comparison of the average length of stay between age groups and infection types is only graphically expressed. It is important to summarize the comparisons made in terms of average length of stay (according to Complications of NS and demographical features) in a single table in terms of the clarity of the study.

The expression in the total column (100.0%) can be removed in Table 2
Please confirm that you have included your review in the 'Comments to Author’ box?

As a minimum standard, please include a few sentences that outline what you think are the authors’ hypothesis/objectives, their main results, and the conclusions drawn. Your report should constructively instruct authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable for publication, or provide detailed reasons as to why the manuscript does not fulfill our criteria for consideration. Please supply appropriate evidence using examples from the manuscript to substantiate your comments. Please break your comments into two bulleted or numbered sections: major and minor comments.

Please note that we may not be able to use your review if no comments are provided.

Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included as text in the 'Comments to Author’ box.

Yes

Are the methods appropriate and well described to allow independent reproduction of experiments?
Please state in the ‘Comments to Authors’ box below what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods (study design, data collection, and data analysis), and what is required, if anything, to improve the quality of reporting

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

Yes

Are you able to assess the statistics?

- Are the statistical test(s) used in this study appropriate and well described?

- Is the exact sample size (n) reported for each experimental group/condition (as a number, not a range)?

- Are the description of any error bars and probability values appropriate?

- Are all error bars defined in the corresponding figure legends?

- Has a sample size calculation been included, or a description and rationale about how sample sizes were chosen?
Please can you confirm which of the following statements apply to your statistical assessment of the manuscript (Please include details of what the authors need to address in the ‘Comments to Author’ box):

I have been able to assess all of the statistics in this manuscript (please refer to checklist above)

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

Yes

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable

Should the manuscript be highlighted for promotional activity?
Articles that are deemed of interest to a broad audience can be promoted in a variety of ways. This could be through email updates, postings on the BioMed Central homepage, social media, blogs and/or press releases. Please indicate in the text box below whether you think this manuscript should be considered for promotional activity, indicating your reasons why (e.g. what is the most newsworthy aspect of the research).

No
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