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.99976
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 30(3); e99976

Peer Review Report for "Risk of Attention Deficit Hyper Activity Disorder After Early Exposure to General Anesthesia; A Case Control Study"

Author(s): Abbas Sedighnejad, Soheil Soltanipour, Alia Saberi, Maryam Kousha, Elham Bidabadi, Gelareh Biazar, Novin Naderi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 29 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 31 Mar 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) 19 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Very interesting subject. The author has followed the appropriate guidelines.
- The title and abstract are informative according to the guidelines
Introduction:
- The rationale and scientific background are comprehensive enough. Objective is well defined though I have one question: - The investigated children were up to four years of age. If so, indicate clearly, please.
Methodology:
- This section needs to be reorganized a bit. Indicate the study design in one sentence. Location and setting are ok, indicate the relevant dates please. Data collection and follow up are written properly. Eligibility criteria and sources are well defined. - Please add matching criteria for controls.
- Statistical analysis should be in methodology section, clearly define sample size, outcomes and statistical tests.
- Results: Well written, easy to understand

- Discussion: Very informative discussion.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
This is a very interesting manuscript. I would suggest reviewing the data analyses because the procedures to perform the regressions were not fully described. Also, the exclusion criteria were not included, just the inclusion one.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Feb 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** (0) 28 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.
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 Editor-in-chief,

We are thankful to the editor and reviewers for their valuable comments on our manuscript. We have applied their recommendations and wish to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further consideration in the journal. Changes in the new version of the manuscript have been highlighted for added sentences in the revised version.

Best Regards

Reviewer 1:
Introduction:

The investigated children were up to four years of age. If so, indicate clearly please

Thanks, indeed, all children with confirmed ADHD diagnosis and their healthy brother or sister enrolled the survey and after that the history of anesthesia exposure before 4 was investigated. Following this quite right comment we revised the text to a more clearly form.

Methodology:
This section needs to be reorganized a bit.

Indicate study design in one sentence.

indicate the relevant dates please

Thanks,The method section has been revised.

Please add matching criteria for controls

Thanks,We did not match the cases and the controls. In order to test and confirm the variables with significant difference in univariate analysis, (sex, history of anesthesia exposure, number of anesthesia exposure and the age when receiving anesthesia), logistic regression method was applied

Statistical analysis should be in methodology section, clearly define sample size, outcomes and statistical tests.

-Done

*Thanks,*In multivariate analysis, we used logistic regression analysis for predicting our main dichotomous outcome (ADHD)

Reviewer 2:

I would suggest reviewing the data analyses because the procedures to perform the regressions were not fully described.

- Thanks, It has been revised and highlighted in the text

Also, the exclusion criteria were not included, just the inclusion one.

- Thanks, The only exclusion criteria was; Family without a proper cooperation which has been added and highlighted in the text.

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) 13 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
In this study, the authors investigated the association between anesthesia exposure in children and ADHD development.
Although it is an important manuscript, I have some notes that I consider relevant to improve the overall quality of the paper.
- In the method, the authors should better describe which instruments were used or the protocol adopted to perform the diagnosis of ADHD, as this is not yet clear.
- Because it evaluates an association between the variables, the data analysis needs to be rewritten because the tests used were not clearly described. For example, was the logistic regression model adjusted for any variable? What are the outcomes analyzed in the model? Why was a non-parametric test used? Did the authors perform a normality test?
- In Table 1, I recommend inserting a column with the value of the tests.
Thanks.

Ana Dragoljub Mandras: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 16 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have completed all that was suggested.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 Mar 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) 18 Mar 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 Editor-in-chief,

We are thankful to the editor and reviewers for their time and productive comments on our manuscript. We have applied their comments and suggestions and wish to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further consideration in the journal. Changes in the revised version of the manuscript are highlighted.

Yours sincerely

Reviewer 1:
In this study the authors investigated the association between anesthesia exposure in children and ADHD development.
Although it is an important manuscript, I have some notes that I consider relevant to improve the overall quality of the paper.

In the method, the authors should better describe which instruments were used or the protocol adopted to perform the diagnosis of ADHD, as this is not yet clear.

-Done

Because it evaluates an association between the variables, the data analysis needs to be rewritten because the tests used were not clearly described. For example,

was the logistic regression model adjusted for any variable?

-The model adjusted for sex, history of anesthesia exposure, number of anesthesia exposure and the age when receiving anesthesia.

What are the outcomes analyzed in the model?

-Done

Why was a non-parametric test used?

-the only continues variable in this study is "age". And Age distribution in cases and controls was not normal so we used Mann-Whitney U test as a non-parametric test.

Did the authors perform a normality test?

-Yes

In Table 1, I recommend inserting a column with the value of the tests.

-Done

Reviewer 2:
The authors have completed all that was suggested

REGARDS

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) 31 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have addressed the concerns raised by the reviewers and have acceptably revised the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 31 Mar 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr for consideration of publication. The third round of peer review of your manuscript is complete. At this time, your manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.