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.110234
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 19(1); e110234

Peer Review Report for "A Pediatric Parathyroid Carcinoma: An Unusual Clinical Presentation and Mini-review"

Author(s): Abbas Rahimi, Roghayeh Shahbazi, Pooneh Nikuei, Sanaz Soleimani, Azadeh Moradkhani, Ali Atashabparvar, Farnaz Khajehrahimi, Ghazal Zoghi, Masoumeh Kheirandish

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Nov 2020
Revised Date:	28 Dec 2020
Accepted Date:	6 Jan 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) — 16 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me as a reviewer. The article was a rare interesting case report , seems to be suitable for publication after minor revision:
1- As the patient age was 15, adolescence age not pediatric age, it is better to change the title from pediatric parathyroid carcinoma to adolescent P.C.
2- Figures: 2-3-4 did not mention in the body of the article.
3- Table 1 contained lab data before and after surgery, I recommend to delete post surgery date and present it in the results section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 25 Nov 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,

Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
In addition to the reviewer's comments, please pay attention to the template of "Case Report" articles of our journal at the https://sites.kowsarpub.com/ijem/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#case_report.html.
The main text of a case report should include 3 sections of "Introduction", "Case presentation" and "Discussion".
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,

The following changes have been made to the manuscript and highlighted:

1. The definition for children includes those age 0-17 years; therefore, the word “pediatric” is placed properly; however, if you prefer the term “adolescent” please let us know.
2. Figures 2,3, 4 and 5 were mentioned in the text. They had been deleted in the first place because you asked to include them in a supplementary file.
3. The post-operative lab data were deleted from the table. Two of the results were already mentioned in the case presentation section. The results for phosphorus was added.
4. Since this case report includes a mini review of the literature, a “review of literature” section has been added and the discussion section has been organized under subsections for better understanding.
5. The name and email address of one of the authors have been spelled incorrectly. Please be kind enough to correct the name and email address of one the authors as follows:
    a. Sanaz Soleimani
    b. Email: sanazsoleymani9262@gmail.com

Regards,

Masoumeh Kheirandish

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) 27 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The revised manuscript was reviewed. It can be accepted for publication; however, according to the journal's standards for a "case report" article, please merge the sections of "Literature review" and "Discussion".
- Moreover, regarding the last sentence of the manuscript "The results of this study suggest that the size of the tumor, the involvement of surrounded soft tissue by the tumor, very high serum level of iPTH, and ALP may be helpful to predict PC in patients with PHPT before the primary operation.", these findings have been previously recognized in the adult population and your study is about a young patient; hence, it is better to replace the term "patients" by "children".
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 27 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs mino revision.
Kind regards,

Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili: EIC | **Revision** (1) 27 Dec 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 (2)

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,

The following changes have been made to the manuscript and highlighted:

1. In the last sentence of the manuscript “patients” was replaced by “children”
2. The literature review and discussion sections were merged.
3. Different sections of the manuscript were organized base on the instructions of the journal.

Regards,

Masoumeh Kheirandish

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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** (2) 5 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
After minor revision that has been done by the authors, it is now suitable for publication.
Thanks.

Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Jan 2021

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