OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.116634
Published in: Health Scope: 10(3); e116634

Peer Review Report for "Causes of Birth of More Than One Thalassemia Major Patient in Families in South-east of Iran: Lessons for Prevention Programs"

Author(s): Ghasem Miri-Aliabad, Seyed Mohammad Nasiraldin Tabatabaei, Zahra Vaezi, Afshin Amini, Leila Asgarzadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	31 May 2021
Revised Date:	8 Aug 2021
Accepted Date:	20 Aug 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 26 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Thank you for choosing me as the reviewer of the manuscript “Causes of birth of two or more than two thalassemia major patients in a family in Southeastern Iran: Lessons for prevention programs ”
Comments to the Authors:
Given the high prevalence of thalassemia in Sistan and Baluchestan and the birth of new cases of thalassemia, the present article is interesting.
1. If the reference to an author is made in the text the reference must be given after the name of the author rather than at the end of a sentence.
Example: Abolghasemi et al.4 in 2007, there were 13879 registered major thalassemia patients, representing an incidence of 23 per 100,000 for thalassemia major in Iran.
2. There are some grammatical English errors.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 26 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
This study deals with the subject of thalassemia and the birth of more than one child with thalassemia in a family, which is one of the health problems in the Sistan and Baluchestan provinces.
The article was reviewed and It has some drawbacks, which I will mention below:
1. Title of table 2 is not appropriate and should be corrected.
2. The contents of the tables should not be repeated in the text.
3. Correct references according to guideline rules. Names of journals are to be abbreviated in accordance with the style of Index Medicus. (ref no 15 should be corrected)
It is acceptable after minor revision and correction of grammatical English errors
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
The comments for this Manuscript are as follows:
1. How did the authors design the checklist?
2. From what year have families been included in the study?
3. In the abstract, the authors mentioned that 635 families we entered the study, but in the method mentioned 116 families were entered. Please clarify it.
4. The manuscript needs English editing.
5. It is suggested to consider this manuscript as short communication.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jul 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Jul 2021

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear Prof. Ramazan Mirzaee,
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Health Scope

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript (**Causes of birth of two or more than two thalassemia major patients in a family in Southeastern Iran: Lessons for prevention programs)**. In what follows, A list of changes after considering the editors' and reviewer's comments (point by point reply to the reviewers' comments):

Reviewer 1:

1- *If reference to an author is made in the text the reference must be given after the name of the author rather than at the end of a sentence.*
Example: Abolghasemi et al.4 in 2007, there were 13879 registered major thalassemia patients, representing an incidence of 23 per 100,000 for thalassemia major in Iran.

Answer: done, Abolghasemi et al.[4] in 2007, there were…….

2- *There are some grammatical English errors.*

Answer: English grammatical errors were corrected.

Reviewer 2:

1- *how did the authors design the checklist?*

Answer: The checklist was designed based on similar studies and the causes that lead to the birth of a child with thalassemia.

2- *From what year have families been included in the study?*

Answer: All families who had more than one child with thalassemia at the time of the study (2018) were included in the study

3- *In the abstract, the authors mentioned that 635 families we entered the study, but in the method mentioned 116 families were entered. Please clarify it.*

Answer: The total number of families with children with thalassemia was 635 families. Of all the families, 116 had two or more children with thalassemia, who were studied.

4. The manuscript needs English editing.

Answer: done

Reviewer 3:

1. *Title of table 2 in not appropriate and should be corrected.*

Answer: done, Title of table 2 changed to" Frequency and mean age of children with beta thalassemia major"

2. *The contents of the tables should not be all repeated in the text.*

Answer: it was corrected. Table 4 shows the level of education of parents with more than one child with thalassemia major.

3. *Correct references according to guideline rules. Names of journals are to be abbreviated in accordance with the style of Index Medicus.(ref no 15 should be corrected)*

Answer: done

> Zeinalian M SA, Fadayee Nobari R, Azin SA. Incidence rate of major beta-thalassemia and study of its causes after prevention and control program of thalassemia in Isfahan Province. Sci J Iran Blood Transfus Organ. 2009;6(4):238-47.

All comments were put under consideration as much as possible. All changes are highlighted in red in the revised copy.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Vahid Sheikhie: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 31 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
All of the requested items are properly revised and edited.
Thanks.

Ali Khaje: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 1 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
Corrections have been made by the authors and the article is acceptable.
Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 2 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
- As mentioned in the first round of peer review, the manuscript should be edited by a English expert. For example, in title, there is errors such as "Causes of birth of two or more than two thalassemia major patients in a family". If the study had done in a family or families?
- Title: it is suggested: Causes of birth of more than one thalassemia major patients in families in Southeast of Iran: Lessons for prevention programs
- The year of the study should be mentioned in the method section.
- Results: "90, 23, and 3 families had 2, 3 and 4 children with TM respectively" it is ambiguous. Rewrite again.
- Do not start the sentences with a number
- Many parts of the article (especially in abstract section) are ambiguous and need to be rewritten.
- In the abstract section, it is stated that the study was conducted on 635 households; however, in the method section it was stated on 116 households. Clarify it.
- Give details about the validity of the checklist and the exact number of items
- How was the data collected from households? What method was used?
- mention the limitations of the project in the end of discussion.
- The conclusion section of the manuscript should be written separately at the end of the article. See the journal guideline.

- Use of the following paper:
Bone Mineral Density (BMD) and Chemical Biomarkers Among Patients with Thalassemia Major and Intermedia in Iran
Best,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 4 Aug 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (1)** 7 Aug 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “Minor revision”.
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear Prof. Ramazan Mirzaee,
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Health Scope

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript (**Causes of birth of two or more than two thalassemia major patients in a family in Southeastern Iran: Lessons for prevention programs)**. In what follows, A list of changes after considering the editors' and reviewer's comments (point by point reply to the reviewers' comments):

Reviewer 2:

- As mentioned in the first round of peer review, the manuscript should be edited by a English expert. For example, in title, there is errors such as "Causes of birth of two or more than two thalassemia major patients in a family". If the study had done in a family or families?
- Title: it is suggested: Causes of birth of more than one thalassemia major patients in families in South east of Iran: Lessons for prevention programs
Answer: done, "Causes of birth of more than one thalassemia major patients in families in South east of Iran: Lessons for prevention programs"

- The year of the study should be mentioned in the method section.
Answer: done," This cross-sectional study was performed on all families of patients with TM referred to Ali-Asghar Pediatric Hospital in Zahedan, south-east of Iran, in 2018."

- Results: "90, 23, and 3 families had 2, 3 and 4 children with TM respectively" it is ambiguous. Rewrite again.
Answer: done," Ninety, twenty-three and three families had more than one thalassemia child and had 2, 3 and 4 children with TM in each family, respectively.
- Do not start the sentences with a number
Answer: done," Ninety, twenty-three and three families had more than one thalassemia child and had 2, 3 and 4 children with TM in each family, respectively.
- Many parts of the article (especially in abstract section) are ambiguous and need to be rewritten.
Answer: done
- In the abstract section, it is stated that the study was conducted on 635 households; however, in the method section it was stated on 116 households. Clarify it.
Answer: done," The total number of families with children with thalassemia was 635 families. Of all the families, 116 families had more than one children with thalassemia, who were studied.

- Give details about the validity of the checklist and the exact number of items

Answer: The checklist was designed based on similar studies and the causes that lead to the birth of a child with thalassemia.

- How was the data collected from households? What method was used?
Answer: Data were collected from patients' records and face-to-face interviews with parents at the time of referral to the thalassemia ward.

- mention the limitations of the project in the end of discussion.

Answer: done," One of the limitations of this study was the impossibility of conducting the study in all thalassemia centers in Sistan and Baluchestan province.

- The conclusion section of the manuscript should be written separately at the end of the article. See the journal guideline.
Answer: done

- Use of the following paper:
Bone Mineral Density (BMD) and Chemical Biomarkers Among Patients with Thalassemia Major and Intermedia in Iran
Answer: done," ref no 9: "9. Ansari-Moghadam A R, Adineh H, Zareban I, Almasy Z, Maghsudlu M. Bone Mineral Density (BMD) and Chemical Biomarkers Among Patients with Thalassemia Major and Intermedia in Iran, Health Scope. 2018 ; 7(4):e64137. doi: 10.5812/jhealthscope.64137."

All comments were put under consideration as much as possible. All changes are highlighted in red in the revised copy.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 10 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
The revision of the manuscript ID:116634 has done well. It could be published in the journal.
Regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 10 Aug 2021

Dear EIC
According to the reviewers comments,all reforms have been done properly, and this article has the ability to publish in journal of health scope.
Sincerely,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 20 Aug 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, Your article has been accepted for publication
Best Regards