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

Hepatitis Monthly
Article DOI: 10.5812/hepatmon.100210
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 21(3); e100210

Peer Review Report for "Interferon-λ3 Gene Polymorphic Variants, rs4803217 and rs12980275, Responsiveness to HBV Vaccine and Outcome of HBV and HCV Exposure in Hemodialyzed Patients"

Author(s): Alicja Grzegorzewska, Wojciech Marcinkowski, Wojciech Warchoł, Adrianna Mostowska, Paweł P. Jagodziński

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 23 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 25 Feb 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) — 2 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Three different vaccines were used to vaccinate the HBV vaccinated group which may result in different outcomes which are not modifiable.
2- The authors have done a novel work with a good sample size which has resulted in reliable outcomes.
3- Please write a few sentences about the limitations of your work.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 13 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
There are a few points that I think need to be addressed to make it suitable for potential publication
1. A minor point that is confusing: in the results section you mention that the weakest LD

was between rs4803217 and rs8099917 (line 232). However, in the discussion you mention that rs4803217 and rs12979860 show weak LD (line 326).
2. Line 274 of the article replace “Dendritic cell antigen 3 (BDCA3)(+) dendritic cells from human blood” with “Human blood dendritic cell antigen 3 (BDCA3)(+) dendritic cells”.
3. line 284 of the article write “Circulating IFN-λ3 levels” instead of “IFN-λ3”.
Yours

Mohammad Heiat: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision based on the reviewers' comments.
Thanks

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,
Thank you for your valuable submission. I invite you to submit a revision before consideration of your manuscript for publication in Hepatitis Monthly.
Regards

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.

To: Editor-in-Chief of Hepatitis Monthly

Dear Prof. **Seyed-Moayed Alavian,**

I am attaching my answers for the Reviewers` comments concerning our paper entitled "Interferon-λ3 gene polymorphic variants rs4803217 and rs12980275, responsiveness to HBV vaccine and outcome of HBV and HCV exposures in hemodialyzed patients".

Answers for the Reviewer 1` comments:

"1-three different vaccines were used to vaccinate the HBV vaccinated group which may result in different outcomes which is not modifiable."

Three vaccines used in our study were evaluated by other authors [Rev Panam Salud Publica. 2004 Jan;15(1):35-40; Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2017 Jan;36(1):94-101] as clinically identical (equally effective). I have added this information into the revised manuscript's Limitations section (lines 365 – 373).

"2- The authors have done a novel work with a good sample size which has resulted in reliable outcomes."

Thank you very much for this remark.

"3- Please write a few sentences about the limitations of your work."

I have introduced the Limitations section in the revised manuscript (lines 367 - 379).

Answers for the Reviewer 2` comments:

"1. A minor point that is confusing: in the results section you mention that the weakest LD was between rs4803217 and rs8099917 (line 232). However, in the discussion you mention that rs4803217 and rs12979860 show weak LD (line 326)."

LD between the rs4803217 and rs12979860 SNPs is discussed in lines 339 – 343. Lines 343 – 344 concern LD between the rs4803217 and rs8099917 variants. By mistake, rs12979860 was used instead of rs8099917. The sentence was adequately corrected in the revised version of our paper. My special thanks for your very insightful review.

"2. Line 274 of the article replace "Dendritic cell antigen 3 (BDCA3)(+) dendritic cells from human blood" with "Human blood dendritic cell antigen 3 (BDCA3)(+) dendritic cells".

I have replaced the phrase (lines 292 – 293).

"3. line 284 of the article write "Circulating IFN-λ3 levels" instead of "IFN-λ3".

I have written the phrase (line 302).

All changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow color. Many thanks for all Reviewers' comments.

Kind regards,

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.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors addressed all the comments by reviewers. I have no more comments and the revised manuscript can be considered for publication.
Regards

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,
Thank you for your submission. I am delighted to inform you that your manuscript is accepted for publication in the Hepatitis Monthly journal.
Regards,