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.98542
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(1); e98542

# Peer Review Report for "Nutritional Status in Non-Syndromic Cyanotic Congenital Heart Diseases Patients: A Single Tertiary Center Study in Iran"

**Author(s):** Mohammad Reza Mirzaaghayan, Azin Ghamari, Amir Salimi, Ehsan Aghaei Moghadam

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 24 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 15 Jan 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) — 7 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
- The manuscript is a retrospective descriptive study of malnutrition in the patient with CHD.
- It is recommended that the study was rewritten as a short communication.
- It is recommended to grading the severity of CHD and evaluate correlation of severity with malnutrition.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 17 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. It would be more informative if interquartile ranges were added to the age, weight, height, and other related measurements rather than mentioning only mean ± SD, both in the abstract and “results” section of the main manuscript.
2. It is better if results and p-values are written independently rather then listing them

together and use “…respectively” both in the abstract to make them easily comprehensible.
3. The authors mentioned that lower weight-for-length was associated with 30-day operative mortality. This may be misleading if the severity of the underlying congenital heart disease and the complexity of the surgical procedure are not accounted for.
4. The manuscript may need language revision for grammatical and syntax errors.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Nov 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) 21 Nov 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.
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 “Nutritional status in non-syndromic cyanotic congenital heart diseases patients: A single tertiary center study in Iran” 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 1:

1- *It is recommended that the study was rewritten as a short communication.*

our response: Unfortunately, the manuscript could not be rewritten in this format, since a lot of valuable information will be missed.

2- *It is recommended to grading the severity of CHD and evaluate correlation of severity with malnutrition.*

our response: grading of the severity of the CHD is added into the body of the text, as we investigated, all patients had CHD with moderate to high severity; therefore, the correlation between the disease severity and malnutrition could not be assessed.

Reviewer 2:

*1. It would be more informative if interquartile ranges were added to the age, weight, height and other related measurements rather than mentioning only mean ± SD, both in the abstract and “results” section of the main manuscript*

our response: The total sample size number 639, so the distribution is assumed to be normal, the interquartile range is useful for small sample size and when the distribution of the samples is not normal.

*2. It is better if results and p-values are written independently rather than listing them together and use “…respectively” both in the abstract to make them easily comprehensible.*

our response: It is revised in the manuscript.

*3. The authors mentioned that lower weight-for-length was associated with 30-day operative mortality. This may be misleading if the severity of the underlying congenital heart disease and the complexity of the surgical procedure are not accounted for.*

our response: It is correct that the more severe and complex cardiac defects are associated with higher mortality rate; but among the growth indices (including WAZ, WLZ, LAZ and BMI Z), only WLZ was found to be associated with mortality rate

*4. The manuscript may need language revision for grammatical and syntax errors*

our response: The grammatical and syntax errors are revised.

Kind Regards,

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) 15 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The rivised manuscript is accepted for publication.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
I am pleased to inform that all the concerns of reviewers have been addressed.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 Jan 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.