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.104402
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(3); e104402

Peer Review Report for "Association Between Duration of Constipation and Frequency of Urinary Tract Infection in Children"

Author(s): Pedram Ataee, Bahare Taleshi , Alireza Eskandarifar , Bijan Nuri, Rama Naghshizadian , Armen Malekian Taghi, Kambiz Eftekhari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 May 2020
Revised Date: 20 May 2020
Accepted Date: 1 Jun 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) — 12 May 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. This manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 May 2020

Dear AE,
I should be grateful if the authors consider these comments about this manuscript. This subject is done in a good way and has novelty in the comparison between the duration of constipation and urinary complaints. In defining constipation you can use the Rome IV criteria instead of Rome 3.
1. Plagiarism detection in the manuscript: It Should be checked by eligible application or software.
2. The analysis method of the manuscript: The analysis was written in a good way.
3. Results: Were completely written and explained.
4. Correct referencing and citations: OK.
5. Correct and proper English writing: It should be revised by a native English editor.

Your decision about this manuscript (accept after English edition).
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 May 2020

Dear AE,
This is a valuable study.
There is no plagiarism, no problem in material and methods and results.
- Please revise keywords, and change the older references with newer ones.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 May 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) 16 May 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the reviewers' requests.
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

Thank you for the valuable comments of dear reviewers.

The corrections in the text were highlighted in red.

Thank you again for your kindness.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

This is a valuable study.

There is no plagiarism, no problem in material and methods and results.

Please revise keywords, and change the older references with newer ones.

Answer: The keywords was revised and the old references were update.

Reviewer 2:

Accept

Answer: Thank you very much for your kindness.

Reviewer 3:

Hi, dear editor-in-chief:

I should be grateful if you consider these comments about this manuscript. This subject is done in a good way and has novelty in the comparison between the duration of constipation

and urinary complaints. In defining constipation you can use the Rome IV criteria instead of Rome 3.

1. Plagiarism detection in the manuscript: It Should be checked by eligible application or software
2. The analysis method of the manuscript: The analysis was written in a good way
3. Results: Were completely written and explained
4. Correct referencing and citations: OK
5. Correct and proper English writing: It should be revised by a native English editor

Your decision about this manuscript (accept after English edition)

Answer:

1. Roman IV criteria were used to the definition of chronic functional constipation.
2. The article was revised by a native English editor.

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) — 26 May 2020

Dear AE,
This is a valuable study. It is well written but needs some minor revision. There is no plagiarism.
There is no problem in the methods and results section.
I ask the authors to:
1- Select keywords based on the MESH database
2- Change some old references if possible.
Thanks.

Amirhossein Hosseini: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 30 May 2020

Dear AE,
The mentioned points were revised in new manuscript and this article is accepted for publication.
Thanks.

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

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

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