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

International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijem.100870
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 18(2); e100870

Peer Review Report for "LT4 and Slow Release T3 Combination: Optimum Therapy for Hypothyroidism?"

Author(s): Fereidoun Azizi, Atieh Amouzegar, Ladan Mehran, Hengameh Abdi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 18 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 24 Mar 2020

Revision (0)

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

Farhad Hosseinpanah: Reviewer | Revision (0) 23 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
This is a narrative review trying to investigate the pros and cons of L-T4 monotherapy versus LT4+LT3 combination therapy and to explore current knowledge regarding combination therapy of LT4 and slow-release T3 (SR-T3) preparations. It is well written and provide a good summary regarding knowledge gap in this field. I have a few comments that needs to be addressed by the authors before publication.
1) It is better to provide exact value of T4/T3 ratio somewhere in the manuscript
2) Reference number 29 seems to be irrelevant
3) There are two reviews addressing effects combination LT4, LT3 on various outcomes; the authors referred to one of them (Ref. 37) . I recommend to cite another one as well.(JCEM 2005;90:49-46)
4) As the author mentioned, The European Thyroid Association has guidelines on the use of LT4-LT3. In contrast to ATA guideline, there are some suggestion with low quality of evidence in favor of L-T4 + L-T3 combination therapy. In order to highlight contradictory recommendations in this field, it is better to mention" recommendations". Here is ETA recommendation. :It is suggested that L-T4 + L-T3 combination therapy might be considered as an experimental approach in compliant L-T4-treated hypothyroid patients who have persistent complaints despite serum TSH values within the reference range, provided

they have previously given support to deal with the chronic nature of their disease and associated autoimmune diseases have been ruled out (2/+00)"
Thanks.

Hossein Delshad: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
This is to thank the authors for the information they have provided in this manuscript. The optimum therapy for hypothyroidism is conflicting and this article has valuable data about an old topic and is pertinent to clarify how to treat hypothyroidism appropriately.
Thanks.

Farhad Hosseinpanah: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on the comments of two reviewers , i can be accepted after minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Mar 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.

Reviewer 1:

Thanks for your approval.

Reviewer 2:

It is better to provide exact value of T4/T3 ratio somewhere in the manuscript.

Response: Agreed and added; page 6, lines 133-134.

Reference number 29 seems to be irrelevant.

Response: Agreed and deleted.

There are two reviews addressing effects combination LT4, LT3 on various outcomes; the authors referred to one of them (Ref. 37) . I recommend to cite another one as well.(JCEM 2005;90:49-46).

Response: Agreed and done; page 6, line 128.

As the author mentioned, The European Thyroid Association has guidelines on the use of LT4-LT3. In contrast to ATA guideline, there are some suggestion with low quality of evidence in favor of L-T4 + L-T3 combination therapy. In order to highlight contradictory recommendations in this field, it is better to mention" recommendations". Here is ETA recommendation. :It is suggested that L-T4 + L-T3 combination therapy might be considered as an experimental approach in compliant L-T4-treated hypothyroid patients who have persistent complaints despite serum TSH values within the reference range, provided they have previously given support to deal with the chronic nature of their disease and associated autoimmune diseases have been ruled out (2/+00)"

Response: Thanks for your comment. Agreed and added; pages 6 & &, lines 139-145.

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.

Farhad Hosseinpanah: Associate Editor | **Revision** (**1**) 21 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
In the revised manuscript the comments given for the different sections have been satisfactorily responded to and accordingly altered. I have no further comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (**1**) 24 Mar 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.