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.96030
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(6); e96030

Peer Review Report for "Monitoring and Nursing for Children with Obstructive Sleep Apnea Syndrome in the Recovery Room After General Anesthesia"

Author(s): Chunxia Pang, Jianni Niu, Lin Zhu, Hong Zhu, Xiaoxiao Hu, Xi Zhang, Shaobo Cheng

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	7 Jul 2019
Revised Date:	22 Oct 2019
Accepted Date:	3 Nov 2019

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) — 11 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks very much. This study's topic is interesting. It is understandable for readers. In the introduction section, author(s) will explain and add about What has been done as nursing care before, which applications have been evaluated?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
the authors have compared the effectiveness of personalized nursing care with routine care on postoperative complications after surgery for OSA. The article is well written and i congratulate the authors for the nice wok. However, I have a few comments which are there in the document attached.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this manuscript. There is no plagiarism detected in the manuscript. the hypothesis and plan were suitable and the results are clearly described. In the Discussion section, recent literature was given as reference. Referencing was correct. English is easy to understand and correct. I suggest this manuscript to be accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
The paper has been examined by our external referees of Iran J Pediatr. All referees agree that this manuscript is interesting and potentially acceptable for publication in our journal. However, a few changes should be made before publication: the reviewers' forms below indicate how the manuscript should be modified.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 20 Sep 2019

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
the authors have compared the effectiveness of personalised nursing care with routine care on postoperative complications after surgery for OSA. The article is well written and i congratulate the authors for the nice wok. However I have a few comments which are there in the document attached.

Comments accepted，we have already checked and revised the full text.

Reviewer 2:
Dear Editor,
Thank you very much. This study's topic is interesting. It is understandable for readers. In the introduction section, author(s) will explain and add about What has been done as nursing care before, which applications have been evaluated?

Comments accepted，we have added previous care work in the introduction and analyzed the shortcomings.

Reviewer 3:

Thank you for submitting this manuscript. There is no plagiarism detected in the manuscript. Your hypothesis and plan were suitable and the results are clearly described. In the Discussion section, recent literature was given as reference. Referencing was correct.

English is easy to understand and correct. I suggest this manuscript to be accepted.

Comments accepted. Thank you for your suggestion.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Your paper has been examined by our external referees of Iran J Pediatr. All referees agree that this manuscript is interesting and potentially acceptable for publication in our journal.

However, a few changes should be made before publication: the reviewers' forms below indicate how your manuscript should be modified.

Thank you. We have made all revision up to Reviewers’ comment.

EIC Decision:

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.

Thank you. We have made all revision up to Reviewers’ comment.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 3 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors have modified the manuscript accordingly and have provided specific answers in an accurate manner. I suggest that this version is suitable for publication in the Iran J Pediatr.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 3 Nov 2019

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.