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.101061
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 19(1); e101061

Peer Review Report for "Diabetes, Hypertension, and Incidence of Chronic Kidney Disease: Is There any Multiplicative or Additive Interaction?"

Author(s): Saeed Erfanpoor, Koorosh Etemad , Sara Kazempour, Farzad Hadaegh, Jalil Hasani, Fereidoun Azizi, Donna Parizadeh, Davood Khalili

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	15 Jan 2020
Revised Date:	15 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	13 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 24 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should correct the details as mentioned carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The study analyzes the long-term association of interaction between prevalent diabetes and hypertension at baseline examination and the long-term incidence of CKD in a population-based study. The study is carefully performed and the follow-up time of the study is impressive.
Comments of a statistical expert is highly recommended.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Jun 2020

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

1- Trend of change in the incidence of diabetes (DM), hypertension (HTN), and chronic kidney disease (CKD) during the time or Cohort effect of each one of these diseases can also show a better picture of the effect of DM and HTN on CKD. Maybe it is a prerequisite for evaluating additive and multiplicative effect of DM and HTN on CKD.

2- Why Cox? Is time of outcome a matter or outcome itself?

3- Where is effect size and its 95% CI or p-value for additive effect in the results part of the abstract?

Thanks.

Arash Ghanbarian: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 30 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,

According to the respected reviewers' comments, the manuscript may be accepted with minor revision.

It would be much grateful if the respected authors revise the manuscript according to the comments.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 30 Jun 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 the reviewers' comments

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewer	Reply by the author(s)	Changes done on page number and line number
1	Trend of change in incidence of diabetes (DM), hypertension (HTN) and chronic kidney disease (CKD) during the time or Cohort effect of each one of these diseases can also show a better picture of the effect of DM and HTN on CKD. Maybe it is a prerequisite for evaluating additive and multiplicative effect of DM and HTN on CKD.	Thanks for your comments. The effect of change of exposures (DM & HTN) on the outcome (CKD) is out of the scope of this paper. However, to reduce the effect of such a bias, we have excluded those who developed diabetes or hypertension besides CKD during the follow-up.	Page 3, the second .paragraph highlighted
	Why Cox? Is time of outcome a matter or outcome itself?	Since the follow-up time is not complete for all participants and there are many subjects censored (before the event happened), we used survival analysis and Cox proportional hazard model to address this issue.	
	Where is effect size and its 95% CI or p-value for additive effect in results part of abstract?	We highlighted these results in the abstract.	Page 1, the third .paragraph highlighted
2	The study analyzes long term association of interaction between prevalent diabetes and hypertension at baseline examination and long term incidence of CKD in a population-based study. The study is carefully performed and the follow-up time of the study is impressive. Comments of a statistical expert is highly recommended.	Thanks for the positive review. By the way, This paper is due to the first author's MSc thesis on epidemiology in the Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Shahid Beheshti University of medical sciences. So, its methodology and	

		statistical issues have been reviewed by experts in epidemiology and biostatistics.	

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) — 18 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The study is carefully performed and analyzed. The design and the follow-up time of the study is impressive.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 12 Oct 2020

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

Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
The revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.