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.99114
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(3); e99114

Peer Review Report for "Umbilical Cord Blood Lipid Profile in Healthy Neonates in Iran"

Author(s): Asadollah Kermani, Kokab Namakin, Gholam Reza Sharifzadeh, Gholam Reza Faal

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 20 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 1 May 2020

Revision (0)

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

Abdulkerim Kasim Baltaci: Reviewer | Revision (0)

15 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
I am writing about paper entitled as “Umbilical cord blood lipid profile in healthy neonates in Birjand, Iran”. Paper was evaluated and my report as following.
Report
- Premature coronary artery disease (CAD) and its risk factors are highly prevalent in Iran. It is well documented that atherosclerosis starts in childhood and there is evidence that this association with adult levels may originate at birth. So assessment of serum lipid levels in neonates might be of importance.
- In this presented study aim cross-sectional study investigated the amount of umbilical cord blood lipid profiles in term and preterm neonates.
- The research design is well and does not include any problems. However, the originality of this study is limited.
- There is no problem in the design of the work, however, the study has originality of the work is limited. Firstly, What is the difference between this study presented from the reports in similar studies previously published in Iran? Authors should answer this. Therefore, the authors must emphasize what novelty this article offers.
- Also, the manuscript should be rich with new references (New references from 2019-to and

2020 can be added).
- After the mentioned major corrections manuscript may be published in the Iranian Journal of Pediatrics.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
I recommend the following changes to this article:
1- The last sentence of the last paragraph of page 2 is not meaningful. (therefore, the aim of this ....)
2- in page 4, In the fourth paragraph, from it was surprisingly observed that.... to the end of the paragraph, Sentences should be written more beautifully and comprehensibly. Now, to understand the meaning of sentences, sentences must be read several times.
3- On page 5, paragraph 2, it is better sentence is changed to this indicates that serum lipids are not related to birth weight but to identify a possible...
4- On page 5, paragraph 4, from Besides there is a marked ...to the end of the paragraph, sentences should be changed to be more beautiful and comprehensible.
5- The explanation under table 1 has no meaning. It is better to change to: this table shows a positive and meaningful correlation between gestational age and between birth weight with TG and HDL respectively
6- The explanation under table 3 is not meaningful and should be changed.
7- The explanation under table 4 is not meaningful.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Mar 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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Mar 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.
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 Professor Ziaee,

Thank you for the email regarding my manuscript (ID 99114). I truly appreciate the time and effort you put into your comments. I looked over the paper and made the following changes:

In response to Reviewer 1

In regard to differences between my paper and others, I would like to respectfully explain that this research was conducted almost a decade after other studies had been carried out. Therefore, all nutritional patterns and lifestyles had changed during this time. As a result, the cultural indicators in this area of Iran differ from those of other parts of the country, such as residence near an international border, lack of resources, and nutritional patterns. Moreover, the present research was noticeably different from other works, in terms of the inclusion and exclusion criteria and the number of samples. Finally, these kinds of studies should be repeated so that results can be generalised for the society as a whole. About the references, I should inform you that seven recent references were included and the old references were removed (2, 3, 4 ,7 ,8 ,9, 10).

In response to Reviewer 2

For the seven points raised, I made revisions and corrections accordingly.

In response to the Associate Editor’s comments

1. "Birjand" was omitted from the title.

2. The necessary number of samples was 285. After consulting with our statistics analyst, 292 samples were studied according to the formula and the optimal error.

3. The main findings were included in the Results section.

4. Male and female samples were included in Table 2.

5. The number of samples was corrected in the last paragraph of the Results section.

6. After looking at Table 1, the data appeared to be correct. The problem was with the explanation which has been corrected.

7. As mentioned before, seven old references were replaced by references from 2019 and 2020.

Thank you so much for your sincere support and consideration.

Best regards,

A.Kermani

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.

Abdulkerim Kasim Baltaci: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 30 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The requested correction was done by the authors and the paper is at an acceptable level.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 1 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors of this manuscript responded to all comments and suggestions from reviews, and all corrections are made in line with expectations, according to that my recommendation for this manuscript is to be accepted and published in your respectful journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 1 May 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.