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.98213
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(1); e98213

Peer Review Report for "Local Anesthetics Allergies in Children"

Author(s): Gülşah Duyuler Ayçin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 3 Nov 2019
Accepted Date: 21 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)

19 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The study aimed to investigate association between LA sensitivity and existing allergies or atopic diseases. This is relevant topic for clinical practice. However, I have some major remarks related to manuscript.
1. General comments: The author is encouraged to use short sentences and avoid subordinate clauses. Preferably write in active voice, rather than passive and in simple present or past tense or consult language editing service.
It is mandatory to consult proper guidelines and related checklist (STROBE,CONSORT...etc)to organize manuscript better.
2. Title and abstract: Indicate study's design. This is more informative.
3. Methodology: Author presented that results of ID and prick test were analyzed in 82 patients examined between dec. 2017-dec. 2018. But then, in the second paragraph, it is stated that "82 patients undergoing prick and ID testing were enrolled"and then testing was explained in such manner that it could easily lead us to conclude that this was not retrospective study. This is a bit confusing since ethic approval dates from 2019. Please indicate specifically what was the study design. Clearly indicated all outcomes. Also indicate how sample size was determined, how data were collected, where there any potential confounders or modifiers. Define clearly every variable (for example: qualify size of

induration and erythema)
4. Results: Present all p with 2 decimals (for example p=0,167 can be put as p=0,17) Avoid writing "p-value" because P is just probability, p is enough. In the table use superscript for type of test performed. For example:
Table: Primary outcomes
Patient A B p
Var 1 11 2 0.02*
Var 2 2 6
*Fisher's exact test...etc
Table 2 tells us that that ID test (1:100 dilution, indicate the dilution because it is important) was positive in 11 (13,4%) patients but there was no association between etiologies and ID test. Then comments are made for every event. I haven't found column for p <0.999. And there was difference in patients with asthma (p<0,0167), you had more patients with negative ID test. Can you comment that? Insert the table for TYPE of reaction, this tells us the underlying mechanism of allergic reaction.
5. Discussion: Summarize your findings first and then link it to literature. You had 2 AD patients, not 4. Check results one more time and correct it. Point out limitations of you study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 21 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The author/s reported skin test results of a selected group of study subjects with suspected local anesthetic allergy.
My criticism is as follows:
1. As per the title it is presumed that the study subjects were all atopic children. But, in the methods section, it has been declared as 'patients in whom surgery could not be performed due to their or their relatives' allergic disease who were sent to allergy outpatient clinic for testing'. This major issue should be clarified.
2. Conclusions in the abstract and the text should be alike.
3. English should be improved. A native speaker should check the grammar.
4. The term 'more allergic' should be revised.
5. The word 'Background' should be revised.
6. The statement should be revised into a more understandable form 'Conditions requiring local anesthesia in atopic children are not uncommon. In practice, it can be difficult.'
7. Drugs, that are amide or ester groups should be emphasized within the text.
8. The statement 'In particular, non-IgE-mediated anaphylactic reactions that are not immunologically oriented should be distinguished' should be clarified.
9. The term 'Late rash' should be revised.
10. Subheadings may improve the presentation of the Methods section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Oct 2019

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) 25 Oct 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.

REVIEWER 1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

1-Title changed.

2- The results in the summary and text were reviewed.

3-Expert in terms of English grammar was consulted.

4-The sentence was corrected.

5-Bacground re-written

6-Bacground has been fixed.

7-Amide and ester group local anesthetics were prescribed.

8-This sentence was re-expressed.

9-Late rash instead of six hours after the rash was written.

10-Methods section reviewed

REVIEWER 2 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

1-English expert was checked.

2-title and summary changed.

3- The study was performed retrospectively. Ethical approval was obtained in 2019. Between December 2017 and December 2018, patients who were investigated for local anesthetic allergy were examined with test results and computer records and the data were collected.

4- All P value is written as in the example. Statistical analysis method was specified. P value was written correctly. Statistically significant results were explained. Table showing the type of reaction was made for patients with a history of drug allergy (table 3).

5-In the discussion, first, our own findings were written and connected to the literature. The number of AD patients was corrected to 2.

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.

Ana Dragoljub Mandras: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 17 Nov 2019

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) 20 Nov 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Nov 2019

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.