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 "**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:

Peer Review

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.68441
Published in: Health Scope: 8(4) ; e68441

Peer Review Report for "The Relationship Between Serum Lead Level and Neurobehavioral Performance"

Author(s): Omid Aminian, Abbass Ali Saneian, nazanin izadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Mar 2018
Revised Date:	2 Feb 2019
Accepted Date:	23 Apr 2019

Revision (0)

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

Hossein Ansari : Reviewer

6 May 2018

1- The results of the main objective of this study (lead level assessment in battery manufacturing workers and its association with neurobehavioral performance) have not been presented in the results section of the abstract
2-two primary sentences in the conclusion of the abstract are the results of this study and not the discussion
3- The exclusion criteria have not been stated properly, and all of these criteria are inclusion criteria
4-the last sentence of the first paragraph in the method section should be rewritten and revised
5-the statistical tests and method of analysis are not correct and should be revised

6-The BLL should be mentioned in the title of Table 1
7-the title of Table 2 is wrong and should be revised based on the contents of Table 2

Mahnaz Shakerian : Reviewer

6 Jul 2018

Dear Authors:
Thank you for your valuable study. The manuscript needs to be highly grammatically fluent. Some other points are mentioned in the uploaded file.
Sincerely yours,

Sara Karimi Zeverdegani : Reviewer

7 Jul 2018

Dear Editor of the Health Scope Journal:
Thanks to the researchers of the manuscript entitled "Occupational exposure of lead induces neurobehavioral deficiency in workers involved in battery manufacturing", this manuscript was reviewed and needs major corrections.

Comments are marked in the article, and some of them are listed below:
- Manuscript needs to be edited literally
- Given that exposure to lead is not specific to the industry, how did you remove the previous exposure to lead in the home or other places?
- Some references are old and need to be replaced(16-19)
- The conclusion should be rewritten and make the fundamental conclusions of the research.
- Tables must be corrected
- In accordance with the book of Occupational Exposure Limits(OEL), the proposed time for lead sampling in biological monitoring is at least one month after exposure to lead or at the end of the shift work. What is the reason for sampling at the beginning of the shift?

- Considering that several studies have been carried out on the relationship between lead exposure and neurobehavioral function, please describe the innovation of this research
"A pilot study of blood lead levels and neurobehavioral function in children living in Chennai, India"

Ramazan Mirzaei : Associate Editor

13 Jul 2018

Dear Authors:

1. The results of the main objective of this study (lead level assessment in battery manufacturing workers and its association with neurobehavioral performance) have not been presented in the results section of the abstract
2. Two primary sentences in the conclusion of the abstract are the results of this study and not the discussion

3. The exclusion criteria have not been stated properly, and all of these criteria are inclusion criteria
4. The last sentence of the first paragraph in the method section should be rewritten and revised
5. The statistical tests and method of analysis are not correct and should be revised
6. The BLL should be mentioned in the title of Table 1
7. The title of Table 2 is wrong and should be revised based on the contents of Table 2

Comments are marked in the article, and some of them are listed below:
- Manuscript needs to be edited literally
- Given that exposure to lead is not specific to the industry, how did you remove the previous exposure to lead in the home or other places?
- Some references are old and need to be replaced(16-19)
- The conclusion should be rewritten to make the fundamental conclusions of the research.
- Tables must be corrected
- In accordance with the book of Occupational Exposure Limits(OEL), the proposed time for lead sampling in biological monitoring is at least one month after exposure to lead or at the end of the shift work. What is the reason for sampling at the beginning of the shift?

- Considering that several studies have been carried out on the relationship between lead exposure and neurobehavioral function, please describe the innovation of this research
"A pilot study of blood lead levels and neurobehavioral function in children living in Chennai, India"
Dear research team,
Thank you for your valuable study. The manuscript needs to be highly grammatically fluent. Some other points are mentioned in the uploaded file.
sincerely yours
Dear editor of the health scope journal
Thanks to the researchers of the manuscript entitled "Occupational exposure of lead induces neurobehavioral deficiency in workers involved in battery manufacturing", this manuscript was reviewed and needs major corrections.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

13 Jul 2018

Dear Authors:
1. The results of the main objective of this study (lead level assessment in battery manufacturing workers and its association with neurobehavioral performance) have not been presented in the results section of the abstract
2. Two primary sentences in the conclusion of the abstract are the results of this study and not the discussion
3. The exclusion criteria have not been stated properly, and all of these criteria are inclusion criteria

4. The last sentence of the first paragraph in the method section should be rewritten and revised
5. The statistical tests and method of analysis are not correct and should be revised
6. The BLL should be mentioned in the title of Table 1
7. The title of Table 2 is wrong and should be revised based on the contents of Table 2

Comments are marked in the article, and some of them are listed below:
- Manuscript needs to be edited literally
- Given that exposure to lead is not specific to the industry, how did you remove the previous exposure to lead in the home or other places?
- Some references are old and need to be replaced(16-19)
- The conclusion should be rewritten to make the fundamental conclusions of the research.
- Tables must be corrected
- In accordance with the book of Occupational Exposure Limits(OEL), the proposed time for lead sampling in biological monitoring is at least one month after exposure to lead or at the end of the shift work. What is the reason for sampling at the beginning of the shift?

- Considering that several studies have been carried out on the relationship between lead exposure and neurobehavioral function, please describe the innovation of this research
"A pilot study of blood lead levels and neurobehavioral function in children living in Chennai, India"
Dear research team,
Thank you for your valuable study. The manuscript needs to be highly grammatically fluent. Some other points are mentioned in the uploaded file.
sincerely yours
Dear editor of the health scope journal
Thanks to the researchers of the manuscript entitled "Occupational exposure to lead induces neurobehavioral deficiency in workers involved in battery manufacturing", this manuscript was reviewed and needs major corrections.

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 editor;

Please find enclosed my revised manuscript entitled "**The relationship between serum lead level and neurobehavioral performance"** from the following authors: ……..

We agreed with reviewer's comments and made changes in this revision accordingly. The detailed point-by-point responses to the comments are attached to this letter. The reviewers' comments are highlighted in the main text. We believe that all comments have been adequately answered and appropriately addressed in this revised manuscript.

Yours Sincerely,

==========
REVIEWERS' COMMENTS
==========

Reviewer 1:

Dear research team,
Hi and thank you for your valuable study,
the manuscript needs highly to be grammatically fluent. Some other points are mentioned through the uploaded file.
Sincerely yours

Reply: Thank for your comment. The manuscript has been edited and revised by a native editor, and the certification has been attached.

Reviewer 2:

Dear editor of health scope journal
This manuscript was reviewed and need to major corrections.

Comments are marked in the article and some of them are listed below:
- Manuscript needs to be edited literally

Reply: Thank for your comment. The manuscript has been edited and revised by a native editor, and the certification has been attached.

- Given that exposure to lead is not specific to the industry, how did you remove the previous exposure to lead in home or other places?

Reply: Thanks to the reviewer for the comment. The researcher had been asked about possible source of environmental exposure such as old house plumbing, shooting field, or having second job such as painting,…and they have been exclude. In the other hand we want to assess the relationship between blood lead level and neurobehavioral tests, so BLL could be an indicator of all sources of exposure. Anyway, because of your valuable comment we mentioned it in the limitation.

- Some references are old and need to be replaced (16-19)

Reply: thanks. References updated and replaced with new ones.

- Conclusion should be rewritten and make the fundamental conclusions of the research.

Reply: thanks for your comment. It has been revised and edited.

- Tables must be corrected

Reply: Thanks for your comment. Tables have been revised. But the styles of other articles in the health scope journal are in the right format.

- In accordance with the book of Occupational Exposure Limits(OEL), the proposed time for lead sampling in biological monitoring is at least one month after exposure to lead or at the end of the shift work. What is the reason for sampling at the beginning of the shift?

Reply: thanks for your comment. According to your comment the best time of sampling is at the end of shift. One of the inclusion criteria was at least 1 year of employment history. Ministry of health in Iran published "the occupational exposure limit" 3th edition (1395) which has recommended biologic monitoring for lead in 3 parts(ZPP 1 months after exposure, ALAD: at the end of week, BLL: optional) : page 127; section 24

.

- Considering that several studies have been carried out on relationship between lead exposure and neurobehavioral function, please describe the innovation of this research "A pilot study of blood lead levels and neurobehavioral function in children living in Chennai, India"

Reply: Thanks to the reviewer for the comment. There are few studied about neurobehavioral performance due to heavy metal exposures in adults, also there are limited studies about this topic in Iran. In the other hand, results of neurobehavioral tests are different among various populations. also neurological examination methods such as MRI,CT scan, Radiography couldn't detect any neurological disorder in the early stage, so we can use these tests as a screening tool.

Reviewer 3:

1- the results of the main objective of this study (lead level assessment in battery manufacturing workers and its association with neurobehavioral performance) have not presented in the result section of the abstract.

Reply: thanks for your valuable comment. It has been added and highlighted in that part.

2-two primary sentences in the conclusion of the abstract are the results of this study and not the discussion

Reply: thanks for your comment. It has been revised and edited.

3-the exclusion criteria have not stated properly and all of these criteria are inclusion criteria.

Reply. Thanks for the comment. The inclusion criteria were being in the production and maintenance line with at least 1 year of work experience, and the exclusion criteria had been selected according to similar studies, also we had excluded incomplete and missing data.

4-the last sentence of the first paragraph in the method section should be rewritten and revised

Reply: thanks for your comment. It has been revised and rewritten.

5-The statistical tests and method of analysis is not correct and should be revised.

Reply: thanks for your careful comment. The structure of table 2 was not understandable. I revised it completely. Table 1 presents baseline characteristics of study population; also we analyzed these variables in accordance of blood lead level.

Table 2 and 3 show the relationship of neurobehavioral tests with working history (as a marker of chronic exposure) ad blood lead level (representative of recent exposure) in two forms; continuous and categorical variables. We used Pearson correlation test for continuous variables in table2 and independent sample t- test for categorical variables.

6-The BLL should be mentioned in the title of table 1.

Reply: Thanks to the reviewer for the comment. It has been revised and highlighted.

7-The title of table 2 is wrong and should be revised based on the contents of table 2.

Reply: Thanks. It has been edited.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Hossein Ansari : Reviewer — 11 Sep 2018

Dear Editor:
1-The authors have mentioned to chi-square test, but it is unknown where they have used this statistical test to analyze the data.
2- It is recommended to use regression models to adjust and control the potential confounders.

Ramazan Mirzaei : Associate Editor — 19 Sep 2018

Dear Authors:
1-The authors have mentioned to chi-square test, but it is unknown where they have used this statistical test to analyze the data.
2- It is recommended to use regression models to adjust and control the potential confounders.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 25 Sep 2018

Dear Authors:
1-The authors have mentioned to chi-square test, but it is unknown where they have used this statistical test to analyze the data.
2- It is recommended to use regression models to adjust and control the potential confounders.

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 editor;

Please find enclosed my revised manuscript entitled “The relationship between serum lead level and neurobehavioral performance.”

We agreed with the reviewer’s comments and made changes in this revision accordingly.

Reviewer 1:

Dear Editor

1-The authors have mentioned to chi-square test, but it is unknown where they have used this statistical test to analyze the data

Reply: Thanks for your comment. (We used chi chi-square test for the association of BLL (<30 & >=30) with categorical variables (job category, shift work,…), but we didn't mention that table. Therefore, it was revised and deleted from the method.

2- It is recommended to use regression models to adjust and control the potential confounders

Reply: Thanks for your accurate comment. Whereas we had multiple dependent variables, and confounding factors for each variable would be different, and we had to provide several tables with regression analysis, we decided not to report that.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Hossein Ansari : Reviewer — 12 Nov 2018

Dear Editor:
The authors should use regression models for each dependent variable to control for potential confounders.

Ramazan Mirzaei : Associate Editor — 23 Nov 2018

Dear Editor-in-Chief
The authors should use regression models for each dependent variable to control for potential confounders.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 23 Nov 2018

Dear authors:
Based on the request reviewers, the authors should use regression models for each dependent variable to control potential confounders.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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 editor;

Please find enclosed my revised manuscript entitled “The relationship between serum lead level and neurobehavioral performance.”

We agreed with the reviewer’s comments and made changes in this revision accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

Reviewer 1:

Dear Editor

The authors should use regression models for dependent variables to control for potential confounders.

Reply: Thanks for your comment; it was revised and added.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Hossein Ansari : Reviewer — 23 Dec 2018

Dear Authors:
1-There are some confounders in this study that it is not clear how the researchers have controlled the. Please explain in detail in this regard.
2-I think there is no need to present Figure 1. Please remove the scattergram gram
3-it should be clarified in Table 1 which statistical tests each of the P values is related to.
4-presenting Table 1 is confusing and is not suitable. I could be better if the “N (%)” transferred to the related rows.

Ramazan Mirzaei : Associate Editor — 31 Jan 2019

Dear Authors:
1-There are some confounders in this study that it is not clear how the researchers have controlled the. Please explain in detail in this regard.
2-I think there is no need to present Figure 1. Please remove the scattergram gram
3-it should be clarified in Table 1 which statistical tests each of the P values is related to.
4-presenting Table 1 is confusing and is not suitable. I could be better if the “N (%)” transferred to the related rows.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 31 Jan 2019

Dear Author
The authors should correct the article based on the reviewers' comments, and my decision is a major revision.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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 editor;

Please find enclosed my revised manuscript entitled “The relationship between serum lead level and neurobehavioral performance.”

We agreed with the reviewer’s comments and made changes in this revision accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

Associate Editor 1:

1-There are some confounders in this study that it is not clear how the researchers have controlled the. Please explain in detail in this regard.

Reply: Thanks for your comment. The regression analysis has been added to control some of the confounding factors.

2-I think there is no need to present Figure 1. Please remove the scattergram gram

Reply: Thanks for your comment. That figure has been removed.

3-it should be clarified in Table 1 which statistical tests each of the P values is related to.

4-presenting Table 1 is confusing and is not suitable. I could be better if the “N (%)” transferred to the related rows.

Reply: Thanks to the reviewer for the comment. Table 1 had been revised and edited, and the statistical method clarified.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

Hossein Ansari : Reviewer — 6 Apr 2019

Dear EIC:
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.

Ramazan Mirzaei : Associate Editor — 23 Apr 2019

Dear EIC:
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments
Best regards

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 23 Apr 2019

Dear EIC:
Your manuscript is accepted.
Best regards