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.107155
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 31(1); e107155

Peer Review Report for "Treatment of Congenital Chylothorax Using High-Dose Octreotide"

Author(s): Jinkyung Seo, Sook Kyung Yum

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 1 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 4 Sep 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) — 12 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
1. The manuscript requires a minor polishing in terms of English language.
2. Was the manuscript prepared according to the CARE checklist?
3. The authors need to elaborate more in the discussions regarding congenital chylothorax, as well as the use of octreotide in this disorder.
4. Revise the references according to the journal's style.
Otherwise, the case might provide some novelty in the field.
Thanks

Prashant Kumar Verma: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 3 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
1. No Plagiarism
2. Experimental -No ethical permission, as unacceptable for a drug administration (that Need a letter from the institute for confirming the comments of the Author)
3. Results - OK
4. Yes
5. Majority- Yes

6. Major Revision after adding review literature / Reject
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 4 Aug 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)** 4 Aug 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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. The manuscript requires a minor polishing in terms of English language.
   - ➔ We sent out manuscript to a professional English editing service prior to the submission. We have uploaded the English Edit Certificate as a separate file. The file's title is "C_200609_01_certificate for editing."

2. Was the manuscript prepared according to the CARE checklist ?

→ I have checked every aspect of CARE checklist.

Title, key Words, Abstract (introduction, main symptoms and important clinical findings, main diagnosis, conclusion), Introduction (two paragraphs summarizing why this case is unique), patient information (de-identified patient specific information, primary concerns and symptoms of the patient, medical history, relevant past interventions) were checked according to the CARE checklist.

Clinical findings, Timeline, Diagnostic assessment, therapeutic intervention, Follow-up and outcome were prepared according to the CARE checklist.

Discussion was preprared according to the CARE Checklist.

3. The authors need to elaborate more in the discussions regarding congenital chylothorax, as well as the use of octreotide in this disorder.

→ We have checked your review and elaborated on more usage of octreotide in congenital chylothorax, as well as other discussing points of congenital chylothorax.

We are submitting two separate files (one file is titled "CC case clean version", and the other file is titled "CC case highlighted version". "We are highlighting newly added sentences as yellow color in this "CC case highlighted version".

(Below are newly added sentences.

Page 1 line 15-16: High dose octreotide therapy~~ idiopathic CC.

Page 3 line 10 : which was increased following parental consent

Page 3 line 23~ Page 4 line 15: with a reported~~~ resulting in reduced flow of chyle (8)

Page 4 line 17~line 18: based on 39 articles reported until October 2017

Page 4 line 24~ Page 5 line 2: However, the severe chylothorax~~ several hours prior to delivery.

4. Revise the references according to the journal's style.

→ The references were rechecked according to the journal's style (AMA style).

Otherwise, the case might provide some novelty in the field.

Reviewer 2:

1. No Plagiarism

→ We declare no plagiarism.

2. No ethical permission, as unacceptable for a drug administration (that Need a letter from the institute for confirming the comments of the Author)

→ Firstly, we have informed about possible side effects of octreotide, and we have explained the high dosage of octreotide and accepted the patient's parents' consent before usage of medication.

Secondly, we have approval from Institutional Review board about this case. We have uploaded this as the separate file with the title "KC20ZISI0361_InstitutionReviewBoard".

Lastly, according to Korea's "Health insurance Review and assessment Service", notification for usage of octreotide is applicable in children with chylothorax or chylous ascites,(0.3mg per day. In case of children, can be increased according to case.) Therefore, our institute did not mandate specifically documented permission before the usage of octreotide. (We have checked several times with the pharmacy department of our institute.) We explained to parents about the dosage and possible side effects, and the parents agreed to the usage of octreotide. We recorded dosage of octreotide every day in records from the beginning.

3. Results – OK

→ We have checked the result

4. Yes

→ We have checked

5. Majority- Yes

→ We have checked

6. Major Revision after adding review literature / Reject
   ➔ We are submitting after major revision

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.

Mihnea-Alexandru Gaman: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 4 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The authors seemed to have accurately addressed my comments.
Please they specify that the written consent of the patient's parents was sought and received. Also, clarify the "Ethical approval".
They wrote "Ethical approval was waived by the institutional review board, because this was a case report of a de-identified patient." and then "This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the Catholic University of Korea, Seoul St Mary's Hospital (IRB No. KC20ZISI0361).". Please clarify.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Sep 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) 4 Sep 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