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.108024
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(4); e108024

Peer Review Report for "Clinical Features of Idiopathic Nephrotic Syndrome and Factors Associated with its Relapse in Children: A Population-Based Study"

Author(s): Abolhassan Seyezadeh, Mohamad Reza Tohidi, Somaye Sheikhi, Mohammad Saleh Seyedzadeh, Sara Hookari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 3 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 22 Nov 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

mostafa sharifian: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Regarding the paper entitled `` Clinical Features of the Idiopathic Nephrotic Syndrome and Some Factors Associated with Its Relapse in Children: A Population-based Cross-Sectional Study; `` which was sent me for review, the following points should be considered:
- In title: (Some and Cross-Sectional) is not needed it is better to delete them from the title. the (Cross-Sectional) is in the methods section.
- In Abstract: a statistically significant association between higher age and steroid resistance. However in steroid responders, there was not any relationship between gender, age at the time of diagnosis`` is more informative adding (in steroid responders).
- Most references of the paper belong to Iranian studies and this is one of the powers of the manuscript.
- References to books should be corrected: first the name of the authors of chapter, the name of the chapter, the authors of the book, the Name of the book and…
- Reference 16 has a new edition of 2016 it is better to change this to the newer edition of this book: (Avner ED, Harmon WE, Niaudet P, Yoshikawa N, Emma F, Goldstein SL.

Pediatric 294 Nephrology. 7th ed. New York: Springer; 2009). Change to 2016 version.
Best wishes

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript entitled "Clinical Features of the Idiopathic Nephrotic Syndrome and Some Factors Associated with Its Relapse in Children: A Population-based Cross-Sectional Study" was reviewed and a long term follow up of a large population of children with nephrotic sx empowers the study, but there are some points to be considered.
1. One of the most common complicatons of NS in children is short stature, unfortunately, there is no data about ht and htSDS.
2. What type of drugs were used independent or fr. relapse pts.
3. What type of AKI they had.
4. What was the cause and type of anemia? was it drug or disease-related or other cause
5. What was the most common type of infection as a complication of dis?
6. How you diagnosed with osteoporosis?
7. In the Discussion, the first paragraph is mostly the result of the study, it is better to limit to main findings of the study.
8. Line 174 is no clearly understood.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has several problem and is not suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 28 Sep 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.

Regards

According to the opinion of the honorable reviewer 1:

1)the title of the article was corrected

2)In abstract, the necessary changes were made

3)Reference No. 16 was corrected

reviewer 2:

1)Although our main goal in this study was to evaluate the clinical course of patients with nephrotic syndrome, but Unfortunately, due to the lack of growth and height criteria of patients in the files, it was not possible to investigate this case, which was added as a limitation of the study.

2) The type of medication used in frequent relapsing or steroid dependent patients was added.

3) We reported two types of kidney failure. The first type was acute and due to hypovolemia and the second type was drug induced, which was modified in the text.

4) Anemia in nephrotic syndrome, like many chronic diseases, can occur in the long process of the disease) Anemia of chronic disease). Of course, the role of drugs cannot be ignored, and in many cases it is not possible to accurately differentiate between the two factors.

5) Urinary tract infection was considered as the most common type of infection in this study, which was corrected in the text.

6) The diagnosis of osteoporosis was made based on bone densitometry, which unfortunately due to technical problems was only done on small number of patients over 18 years old. Therefore, it was removed from the list of drug side effects.

7) The first paragraph of the discussion was as concise as possible.

8) Line 174 was amended.

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) 3 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The author has revised the paper well and it can be published in the journal.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Nov 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Nov 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.