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.102212
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(6); e102212

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of a Probiotic for Functional Chronic Constipation: A Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials"

Author(s): Xiaobin Wu

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 4 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 11 Apr 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) — 23 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting the article in the Iranian Journal of pediatrics. The authors should explain the following:
1. Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.
2. Did these articles begin the main treatment for constipation?
3. Cases that did not receive drug treatment for constipation were not comparable to those receiving the drug. Please explain this.
4. Is there a systematic review registration number?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 25 Mar 2020

Dear AE.
This is valuable study.
- it is better to mention in the title L.reuteri instead of probiotic. since there are variable effects of different strains of probiotics on bowel movement and stool consistency. e.g Saccharomyces bulardi can leads to constipation and is effective in control of diarrhea.

- Please change the key words based on MESH.
- It is better to mention in the conclusion that L.reuteri has had significant improvement in stool frequency but not on stool consistency.
- Please change the very old reference No 4.
hanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
- The number of articles used in this review article was limited.
- It is not new and it is mentioned in the textbooks.
Thanks.

Mandana Rafeey: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Please change the keywords based on MESH
- Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.
- Did these articles begin the main treatment for constipation?
- Is there the number of colony L.reuteri, that was used in any study was important?
- Cases that did not receive drug treatment for constipation were not comparable to those receiving the drug. Please explain this.
- Is there a systematic review registration number?
- it is better to mention in the conclusion that L.reuteri has had significant improvement in stool frequency but not on stool consistency.
- Please change the old references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by three 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.

EDITORIAL CORRECTIONS:

1. please change the keywords based on MESH.

Author Response: We hanve changed the keywords based on MESH.

2. Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.

Author Response: Two reviewers reviewed the titles and abstracts of all articles. Duplicates, articles with a non-RCT study design, review articles, and articles in which there was no diagnosis of FC or no probiotic intervention were excluded. All relevant features included in the test, such as type of FC, strain of probiotics, dose of probiotics, test and duration of follow-up, and characteristics of the patients, were collected and summarized. All eligible RCT studies considered symptom improvement in FC patients as an outcome of interest.

3. Did these articles begin the main treatment for constipation?

Author Response: First of all, the main treatment of FC is to recommend dietary therapy. Moreover, there is no effective treatment for FC. At the beginning of these studies, there was no main treatment for FC. In only one study, lactulose was added to both the control and experimental groups during the treatment.

4. Is there the number of colony L.reuteri, that was used in any study was important?

Author Response: In these studies, the dosage of probiotics used in children was 1×10^8colony. More probiotics are used in adults than in children, but the base number is still 10^8 colony.

5. Cases that did not receive drug treatment for constipation were not comparable to those receiving the drug. Please explain this.

Author Response: The main treatment of FC is to recommend dietary therapy. Moreover, there is no effective treatment for FC. This paper mainly discusses the adjuvant effect of probiotics on FC. We believe that whether to add drug treatment does not affect the effect of adjuvant treatment. It can be compared.

6. Is there a systematic review registration number?

Author Response: First of all, thank you for your reminding. To be sure, our research is not registered, but our meta-analysis is strictly based on the process of system evaluation. And our study is less likely to be biased by human bias.

7. it is better to mention in the conclusion that L.reuteri has had significant improvement in stool frequency but not on stool consistency.

Author Response: We've added that to the conclusion.

8. please change the old references.

Author Response: We hanve changed the old references.

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) 10 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for replying to the suggestions.
In my opinion, the article is acceptable.
Thanks.

Mandana Rafeey: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 Apr 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 11 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
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.