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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Hepatitis Monthly
Article DOI: 10.5812/hepatmon-118965
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 21(12); e118965

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of the Effect of Entecavir and Tenofovir on Serum HBsAg Levels in Chronic HBe-Negative Hepatitis B Patients"

Author(s): Robert Plesniak, Ewa Karpinska, Marta Duczkowska, Marta Wawrzynowicz-Syczewska

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Aug 2021
Revised Date: 22 Mar 2022
Accepted Date: 10 Apr 2022

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)

27 Sep 2021

Dear AE,

With interest I have reviewed the paper entitled “Comparison of the effect of entecavir and tenofovir on serum HBsAg levels in chronic HBe-negative hepatitis B patients”. The paper evaluated the effects of the nucleos(t)ides analogues tenofovir and entecavir on hepatitis B s antigen (HBsAg) concentrations of in the blood of HBV infected individuals.

The methodology used in this manuscript seems sound and the data presented would be of interest to the public. However, the authors should carefully review the English writing to improve the readability of the paper. Furthermore, the first paragraph of the discussion provides interesting background information, which seems more fit for the introduction section.

To conclude, I would suggest revising the manuscript to improve the quality of the English writing.

Yours

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Oct 2021

Dear editor,

Subject of study is interesting. However, the presentation of data in frame of a scientific articles seems weak. This manuscript needs minor revision.

Although materials and method needs a new revision, the result should be re-written in a scientific manner. Majorly, discussion needs more extension.
Author should approve their reasons with similar studies and also compare with the studies which are not in line with present findings. Now, the volume of the text is more or less like a short report. However, it is more valuable and publishable if it will be expanded.
Furthermore, this manuscript is suffering from problem in writing in English.

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Oct 2021

Dear EIC,

According to the reviewer's comments, presented data is worthy. However this manuscript needs minor revision and polishing the English writing . Final decision will be made after reviewing the second version of this manuscript.

Regards

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Oct 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your submission. Please follow the peer-review comments and submit a revision.

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 Editors,

We would like to thank the reviewer 2 for the useful remarks and comments. All suggested changes were marked red.

Ad. 1 M & M

Methods and ‘s’ were added to the ‘Materials and methods’ section title. ‘Study’ was replaced by the ‘study population’

All patients included in our analysis were under regular control of the outpatient hepatology department; only routine tests have been performed in the study population and subsequently analysed. Every patient under control gives his/her written consent to have biochemical, serogical and molecular testing. None of the examination was performed exclusively for the purpose of this study analysis.

Laboratory testing was replaced by the *laboratory assays*, and divided into the following types: ALT, serological assays, molecular assays.

Ad. 2 Results

As suggested, ‘observation’ was replaced by ‘follow up’. The value of 8 was for eight measurements.

The word ‘respectively’ was placed at the end of the sentence.

The sentence “ There was only one case of HBsAg loss and subsequent anti-HBs development, and that was achieved on TDF” was deleted and has been changed to a sentence suggested by the reviewer.

Ad. 3 Discussion

The statement “…what was also observed elsewhere” has been changed.

Thank very much for your valuable comments,

The authors

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) 10 Apr 2022

Dear EIC

This manuscript has been improved, now can be published.

Regards

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (1) 10 Apr 2022

Dear Authors,

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

Regards,
EIC