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.112184
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 21(3); e112184

Peer Review Report for "On the Relationship Between Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease with Body Composition and Bone Mineral Density in Overweight/Obese Adolescents"

Author(s): Zahra Dehnavi, Hanieh Barghchi, Fatemeh Roudi, Mahmoud Belghaisi Naseri, Andisheh Nourozian Ostad, Zahra Khorasanchi, Mohsen Nematy, Farkhondeh Razmpour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 14 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 5 Apr 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)

5 Feb 2021

Dear Editor,

This article titled “Association of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease with Body Composition and Bone Density in Overweight/Obese Adolescents” is an interesting article. However, I have some concern:

1. Fibroscan is not the gold standard in confirming the NAFLD

2. I highly recommend the authors evaluate the association between childhood obesity with bone density. However, you have no liver biopsy; so you couldn't confirm NAFLD by fibroscan without excluding other diagnoses.

3. In discussion part lines 159-169 pure unnecessary pathophysiological issues are discussed in the discussion. You can omit them.

4. This is not molecular research but the discussion part has focused on cytokine or molecular issues. I highly recommend the authors to re-write the discussion and revise it.

5. Using fibroscan in this study is not a strong point in this study. (line 206)

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Feb 2021

Dear authors,

In addition to the referee's opinion, please correct the following:
please explain inclusion criteria, sample size, and sampling method. Explain more about physical activity and scoring.

Regards

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your submission. According reviewer's and editor's comments your manuscript needs revision before consideration for publication in Hepatitis Monthly journal.

Regards,
EIC

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

Dear Reviewing Editor,

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your useful comments and suggestions on the structure of my manuscript.
I have modified the manuscript accordingly, and detailed corrections are listed in response to reviewer comments file.

All corrections are highlighted in the manuscript.

Response to Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. Fibroscan is not the gold standard in confirming the NAFLD

Response: Liver biopsy as the gold standard approach for diagnosing and assessing fatty liver disease is an invasive method, it was not possible to use in the adolescent population in this project. Nevertheless based on the recent studies, CAP and liver stiffness measurement (LSM) are well correlated with the degree of liver steatosis and fibrosis measured by biopsy and have high sensitivity and specificity in the diagnosis of fatty liver disease. Therefore, in the absence of biopsy we used fibroscan to diagnose NAFLD.

2. I highly recommend the authors evaluate the association between childhood obesity with bone density. However, you have no liver biopsy; so you couldn't confirm NAFLD by fibroscan without excluding other diagnoses.

Response: The association between childhood obesity with bone has been studied in previous studies and in the current study, the main purpose is to investigate the relationship between NAFLD and bone density in adolescents.

3. In discussion part lines 159-169 pure unnecessary pathophysiological issues are discussed in the discussion. You can omit them.

Response: Unnecessary pathophysiological issues of the discussion were removed.

4. This is not molecular research but the discussion part has focused on cytokine or molecular issues. I highly recommend the authors to re-write the discussion and revise it.

Response: The molecular issues of the discussion were summarized and the discussion part was revised and highlighted in the manuscript.

5. Using fibroscan in this study is not a strong point in this study. (line 206)

Response: Although fibroscan is not the gold standard in the diagnosis of fatty liver, based on the recent studies, CAP and liver stiffness measurement (LSM) are well correlated with the degree of liver fibrosis and steatosis measured by biopsy; however, given that we did not use liver biopsy as the gold standard, line 206 was removed from the strong points.

Response to Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear
In addition to the referee's opinion, please correct the following:
please explain inclusion criteria, sample size, and sampling method. Explain more about physical activity and scoring.

Response: All of the above were revised and highlighted in the manuscript.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 24 Mar 2021

Dear editor in chief
Dear authors

After regards, I appreciate your cooperation in revising the comments.

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

Dear EIC

The manuscript was studied. All objections were corrected and it could be published in the journal.

Thanks

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Apr 2021

Dear authors,

Thank you for your submission. I am delighted to inform that your manuscript is accepted for publication in Hepatitis Monthly.

Regards,
EIC