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

Iranian Journal of Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijp.102142
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(4); e102142

Peer Review Report for "Does Celiac Disease Affect Antibody Production Against Hepatitis B in Children?"

Author(s): Fatemeh Dastmalchi, Mehri Najafi, Parisa Rahmani, Kambiz Eftekhari, Pejman Rohani, Hosein Alimadadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 19 May 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Jun 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) 3 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Plagiarism detection in the manuscript:
It should be checked by a certified software. But the written text should be revised by a native English editor.
2. The analysis method of the manuscript: No including or excluding criteria were defined in this work. The celiac disease was confirmed by pathology or the level of anti TTG > 10 times was considered as a celiac affected patient? HLA typing was done in CD- affected patients?
The analysis graphs were missed or omitted in this manuscript. But according to this text, the analysis is very simple and tho groups were compared only about the level of anti-HBS ab. I recommend you to compare the quantitative levels of antibody. If your work performed only in a qualitative manner the comparison between them is not logical and no conclusion can be declared by considering this small group of patients and few cases in the control group.

3. Results: No table or statistical graphs were attached to this file.
4. Correct referencing and citations: Acceptable citation but you should clarify their method of work in references 12 and 13.
5. Correct and proper English writing: he written text should be revised by a native English editor
6. Your decision about this manuscript (accept with major revision).
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Apr 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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 9 Apr 2020

Dear Authors,
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.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled [Does celiac disease affect antibody production against hepatitis B in children?] to [*Iranian journal of pediatrics*]. I appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I am grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my paper. I have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. I have highlighted the changes within the manuscript. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Comments from Reviewer 1:

Comment 1: *Plagiarism detection in the manuscript:*

It should be checked by a certified software. But the written text should be revised by a native English editor.

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. I agree with this comment. Therefore, the manuscript was revised by a native English editor.

Comment 2:

The analysis method of the manuscript: No including or excluding criteria were defined in this work. The celiac disease was confirmed by pathology or the level of anti TTG > 10 times was considered as a celiac affected patient? HLA typing was done in CD- affected patients?

The analysis graphs were missed or omitted in this manuscript. But according to this text, the analysis is very simple and tho groups were compared only about the level of anti-HBS ab. I recommend you to compare the quantitative levels of antibody. If your work performed only in a qualitative manner the comparison between them is not logical and no conclusion can be declared by considering this small group of patients and few cases in the control group.

Response: I have, accordingly, revised the manuscript to emphasize this point.

I added the exclusion/inclusion criteria to the manuscript.

Celiac disease was diagnosed in our center based on high levels of anti-TG2 antibody in the presence of MARSH II or III classification in pathology.(we don't have access to RELIBLE HLA Typing in our center and possibly in our country).

Unfortunately, We don't have the anti HBS Ab titers, so we cannot do a quantitative study .our study is only qualitative.

Our study sample size was calculated by a methodologist based on the previous studies.

Comment *3: Results: No table or statistical graphs were attached to this file.*

Response: I added the tables to the manuscript.

Comment 4: Correct referencing and citations: Acceptable citation but you should clarify their method of work in references 12 and 13.

Response: I mentioned the method of studies 12 and 13.

Comment *5: Correct and proper English writing: he written text should be revised by a native English editor.*

Response*: as you mentioned, the paper was revised by a native English editor.*

Comments from Reviewer 2:

*7-*the coun*ts of the words in the abstract were matched (262 words)*

30-ethical considerations were mentioned in the manuscript.

33- two tables were included in the manuscript.

53-acronyms and unique terms were explained in the first time used.

57,58- according to your valuable notes, the manuscript was revised by a native.

with best regards

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) 19 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
As the authors improved their manuscript based on the reviewer's recommendations, I think it can be accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
The second 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