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.105903
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(4); e105903

Peer Review Report for "The Most Common Causes of Benign Esophageal Stricture in Children and the Success Rate of Endoscopic Balloon Dilatation, a Single-Center Experience"

Author(s): Hamid Reza Sadeghi, Mehri Najafi Sani, Fatemeh Farahmand, Hosein Alimadadi, Farzaneh Motamed, Gholam Hosein Fallahi, Kambiz Eftekhari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 14 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 15 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) — 2 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The idea of the manuscript is logical and is written in a good way. But
1. At first what's the aim of this report?
2. This report is limited to one center and one gastroenterologist, so they couldn't speak about the " incidence" of various causes of esophageal stricture. The topic should be revised. Also, I recommend they extend the work to other previous years of performing this procedure in their center.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 3 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this article entitled: “The incidence of various causes of benign esophageal stricture in children and the success rate of endoscopic balloon dilatation” in the “Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics”.

- The article was good and interesting.
- The title of the article is proper.
- The abstract, introduction, methods, and discussion are well written.
- References are up to date.
- English writing is fluent.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Jun 2020

Dear AE,

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

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Jun 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 mino revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Jun 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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear author

Thanks for submitting your article entitled: “The incidence of various causes of benign esophageal stricture in children and the success rate of endoscopic balloon dilatation” in the “Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics”.

The article was good and interesting.

The title of the article is proper.

The abstract, introduction, methods, and discussion are well written.

References are up to date.

English writing is fluent.

Answer: Thank you very much for your kindness.

Reviewer 2:

Hi dear editor-in-chief

1. The idea of manuscript is logical and is written in a good way. But at first what's the aim of this report?

   Answer: The purpose of this study was to identify the most common causes of benign esophageal stricture in children referred to the endoscopy department of the Children's Medical Center Hospital for endoscopic balloon dilatation, and the success rate of this method.

2. This report is limited to one center and one gastroenterologist, so they couldn't speak about the “incidence" of various causes of esophageal stricture. The topic should be revised.

Answer: You are absolutely right, so the title of the article was changed to "The most common causes of benign esophageal stricture in children and the success rate of endoscopic dilatation balloon".

3. Also I recommend them to extend the work to other previous years of performing this procedure in their center.

   Answer: Your suggestion is very good and constructive, so we will continue to evaluation and update the new results.

Reviewer 3:

The article is accepted.

Answer: Thank you very much for your kindness.

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.

Amirhossein Hosseini: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 10 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for the answers and cooperation.
I recommend adding this phrase to the title and then after it is acceptable for publication; "a single-center experience"
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 13 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs revision.
It should be revised based on reviewer comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 Jun 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 (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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your answers and cooperation.
I recommend adding this phrase to the title and then after it is acceptable for publication; "a single-center experience"

Answer: The phrase "a single-center experience" was added to the title.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 14 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
I think after native English edition this article is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 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.