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

Iranian Journal of Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijp.100852
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(3); e100852

Peer Review Report for "Family and School Predictors of Tobacco Use in Chilean Adolescents Aged 13 - 14: A National Study"

Author(s): Alejandra Rodríguez-Fernández, Eduard Maury-Sintjago, Julio Parra-Flores

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 23 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 27 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.

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

Dear AE,
- There is no evidence of approval by a scientific committee in the text.
- For the first time, ENPE and SENDA must be written correctly and completely.
- Is it included in the inclusion criteria, current user or lifetime user?
- The reference numbers do not match in the text.
- In discussion: Explain the reasons for the feminization of cigarette use.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 11 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript was reviewed by our reviewers. As initial decision, the manuscript was found interesting but some revisions have to be made before it can reach a publishable value.
In new revision, please consider following comments:
1- Discussion section is proper, however some findings repeated in this section. Please avoid to repeat detailed results in Discussion.
2- The limitations of this study should explain at the end of discussion.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

11 Feb 2020

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by two reviewers and an Associate Editor. I now have the reports of the Referees, which suggest that your manuscript might be suitable for publication following a number of revisions. I attach some reviewer comments and invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript addressing the points made.

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.

Prof. Vahid Ziaee
Editor-in-Chief
Iranian Journal of Pediatrics

I hereby attach the corrections requested by the reviewers of the manuscript titled “Family and school predictors of tobacco use in Chilean adolescents aged 13-14: A national study”. All comments were acknowledged.

We thank, the valuable contribution of the reviewers and their kindness throughout the process

Best regards,

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
Revisor 1	
1. There is no evidence of approval by a scientific committee in the text.	The following sentence was added: The study was reviewed and approved by the Bioethics and Biosecurity Committee of the Universidad del Bío-Bío.
2. For the first time, ENPE and SENDA must be written correctly and completely.	Acronyms were eliminated. The SENDA acronym will only be included in the acknowledgments section.
3. Is it included in the inclusion criteria, current user or lifetime user?	The inclusion criteria were clarified. The concept is “at some time in their lives” rather than current user or lifetime user. The sample consisted of 11,791 adolescents who met the following inclusion criteria: had used tobacco at some time in their lives and complete information regarding age and sex; adolescents over 15 years were excluded.
4. The reference numbers do not match in the text	This was revised and changed in the text.
5. In discussion: Explain the reasons for the feminization of cigarette use	The following was added in the text: The tobacco industry has been described as using marketing strategies based on female behavior to create products that encourage female tobacco use (17).
Revisor 2	
1. This is a very interesting manuscript.	We agree with the reviewer.
Associate Editor 1	
1- Discussion section is proper, however some findings repeated in this section. Please avoid to repeat detailed results in Discussion.	Detailed results were eliminated in the discussion.
2. The limitations of this study should explain at the end of discussion.	The following was added in the text: The limitations of this study mainly pertain to

	using a database which does not consider some variables that could be relevant to explain the phenomenon.

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) 13 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
In this study, the authors aimed to determine the prevalence of tobacco use in Chilean adolescents and a possible association with family and school problems.
- In the first review, the authors responded to the references. However, I still recommend some further adjustments before the article is fully accepted for publication.
- At the end of the introduction, I suggest that the authors insert at least one hypothesis for the study.
- In the method, because is a national survey, they should better describe how the data were collected (convenience or probabilistic sample?). Are adolescents from all regions of Chile?
- In the results, I strongly recommend entering the value of the Tests in the Table as much as the effect size (because it is a national survey). This is because the level of significance is a very insensitive measure with a large sample since all data tend to be statistically significant. Thus, the effect size is fundamental to show to the readers the exact magnitude of the difference between groups.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The revised version has been reviewed. Revised version seems better than the original manuscript. But based on our reviewer comment, it needs more correction.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
The second round of peer review of your manuscript is completed. I now have the reports of the Referees, which suggest that your manuscript needs more correction.
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.

Prof. Vahid Ziaee
Editor-in-Chief
Iranian Journal of Pediatrics

I hereby attach the corrections requested by the reviewers of the manuscript titled “Family and school predictors of tobacco use in Chilean adolescents aged 13-14: A national study”. All comments were acknowledged.

We thank, the valuable contribution of the reviewers and their kindness throughout the process

Best regards,

COMMENTS	RESPONSES
Revisor 1	
1. *At the end of the introduction, I suggest that the authors insert at least one hypothesis for the study.*	We hypothesize that parental control and better school performance are protective factors against tobacco use, whereas running away from school would be a risk factor.
2. *In the method, because is a national survey, they should better describe how the data were collected (convenience or probabilistic sample?). Are adolescents from all regions of Chile?*	The probabilistic sample consisted of 11,791 adolescents across the 15 political regions in Chile
3. *n the results, I strongly recommend entering the value of the Tests in the Table as much as the effect size (because it is a national survey). This is because the level of significance is a very insensitive measure with a large sample since all data tend to be statistically significant. Thus, the effect size is fundamental to show to the readers the exact magnitude of the difference between groups.*	This was added in the table 1.

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) 27 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the third revision of the article. All the requested changes applied, and the paper also upgraded in the whole sighting.
I have no more comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 27 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
The third round of peer review of your manuscript has been completed, and I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has now been accepted for publication in our journal.
Thanks.