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 "**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:

Peer Review

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/compreped.102388
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(3) ; e102388

Peer Review Report for "Assessment of Correlation Between Costochondritis and Vitamin D Insufficiency in School-age Children"

Author(s): Yazdan Ghandi, Danial Habibi, Ozra Mohajer

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	4 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	3 Jul 2021
Accepted Date:	19 Jul 2021

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

22 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
1. It is expected that in the introduction, citing the most up-to-date sources, the importance of this research will be emphasized.
2. The keyword does not match the MeSh.
3. The main and first lines of Table 2 are empty!
4. Depending on the type of findings of the article, it is expected that in the discussion section, they will be compared with similar, up-to-date, and more valid studies.
5. The conclusion part is very brief and general. Based on the findings and the discussion, a more reasoned conclusion is expected.
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

22 Apr 2021

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

22 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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 Mr. Yazdan Ghandi,

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. We would like to inform you that the peer review of your manuscript is now completed and despite several useful points, it needs "**Minor Revision**". Below you may find the peer review comments. Please reply to them one-by-one and re-submit it again.

Dear Editor

We revised our manuscript based on your valuables commends and we highlighted the revised sentences.

Reviewers' Comments

1. Dear authors, it is expected that in the introduction, citing the most up-to-date sources, the importance of this research will be emphasized.
Answer: based on your valuable comment we revised introduction and cited with up-to-date references.

2. Depending on the type of findings of the article, it is expected that in the discussion section, they will be compared with similar, up-to-date and more valid studies.
Answer: we revised discussion section

3. The keyword does not match the Mesh.
Answer: the keywords matched with Mesh

4. The main and first lines of Table 2 are empty
Answer: amended.

5. The conclusion part is very brief and general. Based on the findings and the discussion, a more reasoned conclusion is expected.
Answer: we revised discussion section

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Ali Valinejadi : Reviewer — 18 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 19 Jul 2021

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

REFEREE : EIC — 19 Jul 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.