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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/compreped.103578
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(3); e103578

Peer Review Report for "Risk Factors of Early Breastfeeding Jaundice: How Can Gynecologists and Nurses be Effective in Reducing It?"

Author(s): Soheila Siroosbakht, Ali Reza Aminian, Bijan Rezakhaniha

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 3 May 2020
Accepted Date: 10 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0)

17 Apr 2020

dear AE,
I thank the authors for all their efforts to publish scientific manuscripts to expand the public knowledge.
Comments:
1- Title is properly selected.
In abstract:
2- In conclusion line 2; “more attention” changes to “attention”.
In introduction:
3- One of the causes of the mother’s unwillingness to breastfeed is receiving serotonin substance reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs). Please notice this point in paragraph 3, line 6.
In methods:
4- In section 3.3. Study Population, line 2 “term neonates” change to “healthy term neonates”.
5- In section 3.5 “P-Value” change to “P valve”.
Results
6- Results are clear and precise.
In discussion:
7- Line 2; “factors” change to “risk factors”

8- Paragraph 5, line 5; “and found that weight <2500 g and inappropriate breastfeeding technique were significant risk factors for jaundice in BFJ” change to “and found that weight <2500 g and inappropriate breastfeeding technique were important risk factors in BFJ”.
9- Please merge paragraphs 8 and 9.
10- Paragraph 9, line 5; “that training should be provided more deeply, in simple methods and frequent for mothers to achieve proper and effective breastfeeding” change to “that training of mothers should be provided more deeply, in simple methods and frequent by nurses to achieve proper and effective breastfeeding”
11- The general limitations and suggestions are presented at the end of the discussion section.
12- In last paragraph, line 7; It is suggested that “effective breastfeeding can be achieved by increasing the quality of education to mothers during pregnancy” change to “It is suggested that effective breastfeeding of mothers can be achieved by increasing the quality of education by midwifery’s and nurses during pregnancy”.
13- Referencing and citations are correct.
14- Tables are accurate and clear, but in tables should be insert the units of measurement (days, no, %,…).
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Apr 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 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

According to the reviewer 1 comment:

The paper is revised and required corrections were applied.
Comments:
Q1. Title is properly selected.

R1. Thanks

In abstract:

Q2.In conclusion line 2; “more attention” change to “attention”.

R2. In conclusion line 2; “more attention” was changed to “attention”.

In introduction:

Q3. One of cause of mother’s unwillingness to breastfeed is receiving serotonin substance reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs). Please notice this point in paragraph 3, line 6.

R3. This point was mentioned in paragraph 3, line 6.

In methods:

Q4. In section 3.3, Study Population, line 2 “term neonates” change to “healthy term neonates”.

R4. In section 3.3, Study Population, line 2 “term neonates” was changed to “healthy term neonates”.

Q5. In section 3.5 “P-Value” change to “*P* valve”.

R5. In section 3.5 “P-Value” was changed to “*P* valve”.

Results

Q6. Results are clear and precise.

R6. Thanks.

In discussion:

Q7. Line 2; “factors” change to “risk factors”.

R7. Line 2; “factors” was changed to “risk factors”.

Q8. Paragraph 5, line 5; “and found that weight <2500 g and inappropriate breastfeeding technique were significant risk factors for jaundice in BFJ” change to “and found that weight <2500 g and inappropriate breastfeeding technique were important risk factors in BFJ”.

R8. Paragraph 5, line 5, changes were done.

Q9. Please merge paragraphs 8.and 9.

R9. Paragraphs 8.and 9 were merged.

Q10. Paragraph 9, line 5; “that training should be provided more deeply, in simple methods and frequent for mothers to achieve proper and effective breastfeeding” change to “that training of mothers should be provided more deeply, in simple methods and frequent by nurses to achieve proper and effective breastfeeding”.

R10. Paragraph 9, line 5, changes were done.

Q11. The general limitations and suggestions are presented at the end of the discussion section.

R11. The general limitations and suggestions were presented at the end of the discussion section.

Q12- In last paragraph, line 7; It is suggested that “effective breastfeeding can be achieved by increasing the quality of education to mothers during pregnancy” change to “It is suggested that effective breastfeeding of mothers can be achieved by increasing the quality of education by midwifery’s and nurses during pregnancy”.

R12. In last paragraph, line 7, changes were done.

Q13. Referencing and citations are correct.

R13.Thanks.
Q14. Tables are accurate and clear, but in tables should be insert the units of measurement. (days, no, %,…).

R14. In tables were inserted the units of measurement (days, no, %,…).

Thanks

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) 6 May 2020

Dear AE,
All points mentioned have been changed by the authors. The manuscript is now acceptable and printable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 10 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is accepted for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 10 May 2020

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