**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.100891
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 20(7); e100891

# Peer Review Report for "Relationship Between 25-HydroxyVitamin D Level and Liver Stiffness in Patients with Chronic Hepatitis B Using Transient Elastography"

**Author(s):** Seyed Jalal Hashemi, Abazar Parsi, Eskandar Hajiani, Abdolrahim Masjedizadeh, Aliakbar Shayesteh

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 8 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 10 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

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

**Pezhman Alavinejad**: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 19 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
Comments:
1. The abstract section should be improved.
2. In the introduction section, the reference of this sentence in missed “Given the increased rate of HBV infections due to antiviral resistance in recent years”.
3. Is there any threshold for ALT in inclusion criteria? Because raising serum transaminases could affect the accuracy of elastography.
4. The English writing and grammar should revise and improve.
Thanks.

**Seyed Moayed Alavian**: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 2 May 2020

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,

**Seyed Moayed Alavian**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 May 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

*Reply to Reviewers*

*Reviewer 1:*
*Comments:*
*1. The abstract section should be improved.*

*Response: The abstract section was improved.*

*2. In introduction section, the reference of this sentence in missed "Given the increased rate of HBV infections due to antiviral resistance in recent years".*

*Response: the references were added.*

*3. Is there any threshold for ALT in inclusion criteria? Because raising serum transaminases could affect accuracy of elastography.*

*Response: the threshold for ALT was equal or more 100 mg/dl.*

*4. The English writing and grammar should revise and improve.*

*Response: The English writing and grammar were revised and improved.*

**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.

**Pezhman Alavinejad**: Reviewer | **Revision (1)** 28 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

**Seyed Moayed Alavian**: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 10 Jul 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

**Seyed Moayed Alavian**: EIC | **Revision (1)** 10 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.