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.108683
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 31(2); e108683

Peer Review Report for "Avoiding Unnecessary Exposure to General Anesthesia for Dental Treatments in the First Years of Life"

Author(s): Nahid Ramazani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 6 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 17 Dec 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)

31 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The letter has raised a valid concern which is a critical point in pediatric dentistry.
Some points may improve the manuscript:
- Keywords: I think the word “child” is not a suitable keyword.
- Line 9: the phrase “article mentioned” should be replaced by “mentioned article”.
- Line 13: I am not sure about the phrase: “long been widely accepted”. It may be better to omit the word “long” or change the sentence.
- Line 17: the sentence “defined cases ….” Is not grammatically correct.
- Line 18: I suggest the word “generally” or “often” in exchange for “systematically”.
- Line 20: the sentence “using GA …” should be re-written. I suggest: by using GA all treatments including pulp therapy, restoration and extraction can be completed (provided) in one session.
- Line 24: the sentence “by adhering …” has a grammatical failure. I suggest: treatments have been completed….
- Line 27: “revealed disadvantages” should replace “disadvantages revealed”.
- Line 34: the sentence “moreover, in regards…” should be rewritten and also needs a

reference.
- Line 38: “being” may be better to be replaced by “to be” or it may be better to be replaced by: “the probability of adverse effect on the brain particularly up to the age …”
- Line 40: the sentence “it is necessary …” needs a reference.
- Line 43: I suggest “first” in exchange for the word “early”.
- Line 45: the sentence “there are certain …” needs a reference.
General comment: the letter needs to be rewritten in order to get improved in terms of consistency and flow. I recommend the aforementioned minor revisions.
With best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 13 Nov 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 minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 13 Nov 2020

Dear Authros,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by a reviewer 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.

Dear editor in chief

Thanks for considering my manuscript entitled “Avoiding Unnecessary Dental General Anesthesia Exposure in Early Life” as “minor revision required”. The response to reviewers are as below:

Reviewer 1:

The letter has raised a valid concern which is a critical point in pediatric dentistry. Some points may improve the manuscript:

Keywords: I think the word “child” is not a suitable keyword. It was replaced with “dental treatments”

Line 9: the phrase “article mentioned” should be replaced by “mentioned article”. The sentence was edited.

Line 13: I am not sure about the phrase: “long been widely accepted”. It may be better to omit the word “long” or change the sentence. “Long” were deleted.

Line 17: the sentence “defined cases ….” Is not grammatically correct. It was edited.

Line 18: I suggest the word “generally” or “often” in exchange for “systematically”. “Systematically” was deleted.

Line 20: the sentence “using GA …” should be re-written. I suggest: by using GA all treatments including pulp therapy, restoration and extraction can be completed (provided) in one session. It was corrected.

Line 24: the sentence “by adhering …” has a grammatical failure. I suggest: treatments have been completed….It was corrected.

Line 27: “revealed disadvantages” should replace “disadvantages revealed”. It was edited.

Line 34: the sentence “moreover, in regards…” should be rewritten and also needs a reference. The sentence was edited and the reference was added.

Line 38: “being” may be better to be replaced by “to be” or it may be better to be replaced by: “the probability of adverse effect on the brain particularly up to the age …” It was corrected in the text.

Line 40: the sentence “it is necessary …” needs a reference. Reference was added.

Line 43: I suggest “first” in exchange for the word “early”. It was edited.

Line 45: the sentence “there are certain …” needs reference. Reference was added.

General comment: the letter needs to be rewritten in order to get improved in terms of consistency and flow. I recommend the aforementioned minor revisions. English editing was done. I will send certificate if necessary.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 17 Dec 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