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.98540
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(5); e98540

Peer Review Report for "A 3-Year Single Surgeon Experience of the Arterial Switch Operation"

Author(s): Mohammad Reza Mirzaaghayan, Azin Ghamari, Sima Amini, Ali Rabbani, Ali Mohebbi, Ehsan Aghaei Moghadam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 10 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Mandana Kashaki: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 12 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
I think it was a valuable study, the title reflects the content appropriately, the abstract describes the content, the analysis method is appropriate and supports conclusions, referencing is correct and appropriate, Proper English grammar and writing and finally the manuscript is acceptable.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 16 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
This is a large single instriution series of ASO procedure performed only in 2 years by a single surgeon. However, the data is not present very well.
Comments for the authros:
- The abstact is too long. Please make it short and concise. Please make clear of the objective. The result in the abstract should be shourted to focus on their objectives. If the coraory pattern is with your inineterset of research, plese reefer it in this secton.
- In the method and materials section

- Please specify what is usual what is unusual coronary pattern? Surgical method should be detailed, as well as statistical method.
- In the results section
- Data should be presented according to your study aims, which is coronary pattern, as a potential risk factor for adverse outcomes? You can also make a comparison between VSD/ IVS group. In addition to univariate analysis, please also include multivariate analysis. More tables are encouraged to be used to present your data better.
- What are the data of follow-up?
In the discussion section
- Please discuss around your results.
- You have a median/mean age of 28 days? But it seems all were one-stage ASO. Do you have fast track staged ASO after PAB for LV training? As some of your patients seems to have be too old for direct ASO.
- Follow-up should also be discussed.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Your manuscript was reviewed by our reviewers. As an initial decision, your manuscript was found interesting but some revisions have to be made before it can reach a publishable value.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 21 Feb 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.
Regards

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 reviews,

We wanted to appreciate your detailed and professional points of view. We did our best to cover all your invaluable comments. We revised the manuscript entitled “A 3-year single surgeon experience of the Arterial Switch Operation” based on these comments. We hope to be acceptable. The changes applied based on the comments have been highlighted in the file and are:

Reviewer 2:

This is a large single institution series of ASO procedure performed only in 2 years by a single surgeon. However, the data is not present very well.

The abstract is too long. Please make it short and concise. Please make clear of the objective. The result in the abstract should be shortened to focus on their objectives. If the coronary pattern is with your interest of research, please reefer it in this section.

Our response: The abstract is shortened and the objective has been made clearer.

In the method and materials section, please specify what is usual what is unusual coronary pattern? Surgical method should be detailed, as well as statistical method.

Our response: The usual coronary pattern, surgical method and statistical analysis part are included; moreover, this part is divided into several parts to be more understandable.

In the results section, data should be presented according to your study aims, which is coronary pattern, as a potential risk factor for adverse outcomes? You can also make a comparison between VSD/ IVS group. In addition to univariate analysis, please also include multivariate analysis. More tables are encouraged to be used to present your data better.

What are the data of follow-up?

Our response: The data presentation is revised. The data regarding the coronary pattern and its association with complications will be presented in another study. The comparison between IVS/VSD groups are indicated in the result part of the manuscript. The univariate analysis was not applied in this study. More tables are presented. We did not aim to include long-term follow-up of these patients in the present study.

In the discussion section

Please discuss around your results.

You have a median/mean age of 28 days? But it seems all were one-stage ASO. Do you have fast track staged ASO after PAB for LV training? As some of your patients seems to have be too old for direct ASO.

Follow-up should also be discussed.

Our response: five patients undergone two-stage surgery; the data of these patients is added in the results part. The average age of these patients is 162 days which increases the average age of 125 patients. We did not aim to include long-term follow-up of these patients in the present study.

Kind Regards,

Ehsan Aghaei Moghadam, corresponding author

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) 22 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Please note univariate analysis is not a specific statistical method. It includes T test and Mann-Whitney U test, etc. Please perform multivariate analysis to identify risk factors of postoperative complications and adverse outcomes in view of your study aim.
2. Please double check your ending year when subjects were included, 2017 or 2018?
3. How many hours exactly before and after surgery were the lactate measured?
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Jun 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
The second round of peer review of your manuscript is completed. I now have the reports of the Referees, which suggest that your manuscript needs more correction.
Thanks

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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 reviews,

We wanted to appreciate your detailed and professional points of view. We did our best to cover all your invaluable comments. We revised the manuscript entitled “A 3-year single surgeon experience of the Arterial Switch Operation” based on these comments. We hope to be acceptable. The changes applied based on the comments have been highlighted in the file and are:

Reviewer 2:

Reviewer 1:

1. Please note univariate analysis is not a specific statistical method. It includes T test and Mann-Whitney U test, etc. Please perform multivariate analysis to identify risk factors of postoperative complications and adverse outcomes in view of your study aim.

Our response: We double checked the data analyze with another statistician, as we precisely evaluated, univariate analysis is sufficient for this paper. Risk factors of the post-operative complications will be discussed in another paper with a larger sample size.

2.Please double check your ending year when subjects were included, 2017 or 2018?

Our response: 2018 is correct, this is revised in the manuscript.

3.how many hours exactly before and after surgery were the lactate measured?

Our response: The lactate level was measured immediately before and after sugry.

Kind Regards,

Ehsan Aghaei Moghadam, corresponding author

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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** (2) 26 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the third revision of the article. All the requested changes applied, and the paper also upgraded in the whole sighting.
I have no more comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 26 Jul 2020

Dear Authors,
The third 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