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.108002
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 20(9); e108002

Peer Review Report for "Look-Back Study of Transfusion-Transmitted Hepatitis C Virus Infection in Iran"

Author(s): Fahimeh Ranjbar Kermani, Sedigheh Amini-Kafiabad, Kamran Mousavi Hosseini, Mahtab Maghsudlu, Zohreh Sharifi, Mohammad Ali Mansournia

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 4 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 10 Oct 2020

Revision (0)

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

Mahdi Mashhadi Akbar Boojar: Reviewer | Revision (0) 12 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript was evaluated the risk of HCV transmitting through blood transfusions.
- In my opinion, this research should not be submitted as an original research article. At best, this manuscript can be considered as short communication research.
- The exact number of participants was 280 donors as mentioned in the manuscript. In my opinion, this amount is not enough to judge the whole of Iran.
- Unfortunately, ethical considerations were note specified in the manuscript.
- The number of references is small and their format does not match the format of the journal.
- Line 77: standard operating procedures (SOPs): Please use the acronym form as already mentioned (Already defined.).
- Why is the data relevant to three years ago?
- Strong spelling and grammar editing required:
contribute in → contribute to
centerss → centers
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 Sep 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) 30 Sep 2020

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 reviewer:
Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript "**Look-back study of transfusion-transmitted hepatitis C virus infection in Iran**" for publication in your valuable journal. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper. We have incorporated the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted within the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

1.This manuscript was evaluated the risk of HCV transmitting through blood transfusions. In my opinion, this research should not be submitted as an original research article.
At best, this manuscript can be considered as short communication research.
The exact number of participants was 280 donors as mentioned in the manuscript. In my opinion, this amount is not enough to judge the whole of Iran.

Thank you for pointing this out. This manuscript was not evaluated the risk of HCV transmitting through blood transfusions. Look back study in blood transfusion means tracking the blood of donors who have been negative in previous donations and whose blood has been transferred to recipients but whose current donation has been positive (who are not a large number). Given that it is possible that he/she is in the window period of infection in his/her previous donation, this person is subject to follow-up and look back to know the fate of his/her previous donation. In this case, in a period of time, the fate of all his previous donations, which were negative, is examined and the recipients of blood and blood products are identified and examined whether the infection has been transmitted to them from these donations or not? And this is different from examining the risk of HCV transmission of infection through blood and products in all recipients (who are a large number).
This look back study was conducted on HCV confirmed blood donors in the country who have been negative in previous donations (but not on all blood donors, according to look back definition) and during the study period, 280 blood donors were HCV confirmed blood donors whose previous donations were negative. It was corrected in "Abstract" and "Materials and methods" part.

2. Unfortunately, ethical considerations were note specified in the manuscript.

The reviewer is correct. The statement 'The Ethics Committee of High Institute for Research and Education in Transfusion Medicine, Tehran, Iran was responsible for approving the study (code No: IR.TMI.REC.1394.1800)" was included in submission step. However, it was included in the text.

3. The number of references is small and their format does not match the format of the journal.

While we appreciate the reviewer's feedback, but we have to remind that the number of papers in this issue is small!
Format was matched. I tried to uploaded EndNot file but the site did not allow.

4- Line 77: standard operating procedures (SOPs): Please use the acronym form as already mentioned (Already defined.).

As suggested by the reviewer, acronym was used for “standard operating procedures”.

5. Why is the data relevant to three years ago?

We agree with the reviewer’s assessment but we study period was three years.

6. Strong spelling and grammar editing required:
contribute in → contribute to: Is corrected
centerss → centers: Is ccorrected
Thank you for pointing this out, spelling and grammar of the manuscript were edited.

Best regards: Dr. Sedigheh Amini Kafi-Abad- Corresponding author

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.

Abdol Majid Cheraghali: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 10 Oct 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 Oct 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.