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.108704
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(1); e108704

Peer Review Report for "The Impact of Maternal Breast Milk in Preventing Necrotizing Enterocolitis: A Narrative Review"

Author(s): Siamak Afaghi, Fateme Sadat Rahimi, Farzad Esmaeili Tarki, Sahar Yazdani, Amirhossein Hosseini, Aliakbar Sayyari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Sep 2020
Revised Date: 28 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 16 Jan 2021

Revision (0)

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

Fereshteh Karbasian: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 25 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript needs a minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 4 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Total Score: (min: 0, max: 20): 9
Title
1) Proper Article TITLE? Yes
2) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? Yes
3) Is there any abbreviation in the TITLE? No
4) Importance and originality of the subject? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?) Yes
5) Proper Authors' names and institutional affiliations? No information
6) Source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these? No information

Abstract

7) Is there structured ABSTRACT? No

8) How many words are there in the ABSTRACT (Count = 250-350)?

9) Accurateness and adequacy of the ABSTRACT? (Does the abstract describe the content accurately?)

10) Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected form MESH (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)? Not all of them.

Introduction

11) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) Yes

Does INTRODUCTION include: “What we know”, “What we don’t know” and “Aims”?

The authors should explain why this review article is necessary and what information gap it fills.

Materials And Methods

1) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)? Not Applicable (N/A)

2) Study Design Described Sufficiently? No

3) Adequacy of the sample studied? N/A

4) Subjects Representative of Target Population? N/A

5) Provided sample size calculation or justification? N/A

6) Control Subjects Appropriate? N/A

7) Power of study declared? N/A

8) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? N/A

9) Blinding of Investigators (if possible)? N/A

10) Blinding of subjects (if possible)? N/A

12) Identify the methods, apparatus (give the manufacturer’s name and address in parentheses)? N/A

11) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results? No

12) Give references to established methods and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known? No

13) Describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations? No

14) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration? N/A

15) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? No

16) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? N/A

17) Identified all statistical methods unambiguously? N/A

18) Explain Ethical Considerations? N/A

Review Articles

19) Authors submitting review manuscripts should include a section describing the methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data? The methods used for selecting articles were not clearly described. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for articles were not defined.

Case Report

20) Proper writing of principles and elements of Medical History?

21) Indicating of Para clinic examination?

22) Is there any Image, figures and tables for Case presentation?

23) Consideration of medical ethics for case presentation? (Are there any special ethical concerns arising from the use of human or other animal subjects?)

Results

24) Accuracy of the interpretation of RESULTS? Yes

25) RESULTS recorded appropriately? Yes

26) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the TABLES AND FIGURES? Yes. The title of table should appear at the top. The result of the studies could also be summarized in the form of a table.

27) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? Yes

28) Repeat the data in the tables and Text? No

29) Emphasize or summarize only important observations? Yes

30) Any Appendix for extra or supplementary materials and technical detail? No

31) Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support? Yes

32) Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries? No

33) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? No

34) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample.”? No

Discussion

35) Relevance of the DISCUSSION section? No

36) CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated? No

37) What CONCLUSIONS would you draw from these results? No

38) Analysis supports CONCLUSIONS? No

39) Are the conclusions supported by the discussion? No

Discussion needs to be written and the author should add his/her opinion while summarizing others.

References

40) Appropriateness of the REFERENCES? Yes

41) Proper Writing of the REFERENCES? Yes

42) References for the last 5 years? Most of them.

43) Which type of writing is observed for references (Vancouver, Harward, Oxford, etc)? Vancouver

44) Indicate references in parentheses? Yes

References should be numbered in the order in which they appear in the text. (ref. no. 73 in the sec.1.8 in the results)

General Review

45) Proper Style for Medical Writing? Ok

46) Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used? No

47) Proper English Grammar and Writing? ok

48) Which sections are too long? none

49) Which sections are too short? The discussion needs to be written.

50) Which sections of this manuscript could be misunderstood? none

51) Describe the three major weaknesses of this paper:

52) 1. What is its innovation 2? Lack of discussion 3. Lack of reviewer opinion

53) What additional information would you need to reproduce this study? Complete methods
54) Your Final Conclusion is Major Revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

8 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. The authors may correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

8 Nov 2020

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.

Reply to Reviewers:

Title

Q 1: Proper Authors' names and institutional affiliations?
A1: The Authors' names and affiliations are written in "Title page" accordingly.

"[1] Siamak Afaghi, Medical researcher, Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition Center, Research Institute for Children's Health, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Siamak.afaghi@sbmu.ac.ir

[2] Fateme Sadat Rahimi, Medical Intern, Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition Center, Research Institute for Children's Health, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. t.rahimi@sbmu.ac.ir

[3] Farzad Esmaeili Tarki, Medical researcher, Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

[4] Sahar Yazdani, Medical researcher, Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition Center, Research Institute for Children's Health, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. s.yaazdani@gmail.com

[5] Amirhossein Hosseini, Assistant Professor of Pediatric Gastroenterohepatology, Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition Research Center, Research Institute for Children's Health, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. ah.hosseini@sbmu.ac.ir

[6] Ali Akbar Sayyari, Professor of Pediatric Gastroenterohepatology, Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition Research Center, Research Institute for Children's Health, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran."

Q2: Source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these?
A2: We declare that no funding was secured for this study.

Abstract

Q3: Is there structured ABSTRACT?
A3: The ABSTRACT format is changed to structured type.

Q4: How many words are there in the ABSTRACT (Count = 250-350)?
A4: Abstract Word count is 260 words

Q5: Accurateness and adequacy of the ABSTRACT? (Does the abstract describe the content accurately?)
A5: Yes, The ABSTRACT describes the content accurately.

Q6: Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected form MESH (*http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html*)?
A6: the following Keywords are selected from MESH: "Enterocolitis; breast feeding; milk; premature birth; infant; immunity."

Materials and Methods for Review Articles

Q7: Authors submitting review manuscripts should include a section describing the methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data?
A7: Thank you for your comment. The study design is now being described thoroughly. Also, the Inclusion and Exclusion criteria of this study has been explained completely.
"Articles were deemed suitable for analysis if (1) they involved premature infants receiving HM feedings, (2) a primary or secondary result was NEC, and (3) original data-driven study was identified. Excluded from the study is animal experiments, quality management programs, case notes, case series, recommendations, book chapters, and review papers. According to the mentioned criteria, at the end, of all the 393 articles studied and evaluated, 29 were excluded.
For definite exclusion criteria and duplication, abstracts of papers found by the initial search were screened. Remaining publications were then obtained and their complete texts read and evaluated for conditions for eligibility. If confusion occurred about the eligibility of an article, all reviewers debated the article and a conclusion was settled to. Each reviewer used a standard table for all final papers to collect data, including demographic detail, research design, HM type and dosage given, result, and level of evidence."

Results

Q8: Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the TABLES AND FIGURES?
A8: Yes, the title of table is written at the top. Although, the results are summarized in the form of a table.

Discussion

Q9: Relevance of the DISCUSSION section?
A9: Discussion section is completely relevant to the potential presentational effect of bio-components found in humans' milk.

Q10: CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated?
A10: Yes, they are extracted from reliable studies.

Q11: What CONCLUSIONS would you draw from these results?
A11: In Discussion section, the presentational effect of MOM and DHM rather than Formula is discussed by means of previous studies as well as timing and amount of feeding.

Q12: Analysis supports CONCLUSIONS?

A13: No, in this narrative review no analysis is conducted.

Q13: Are the conclusions supported by the discussion?
A13: Yes, Conclusion Section is followed by Discussion Section.

General Review

Q14: Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used?
A14: Yes, the acronyms are explained for the first time:
“MOM = Mother’s Own Milk, DHM= Donor Human Milk, NEC= Necrotizing EnteroColitis”

Q15: Which sections are too short?
A15: Discussion has been written more comprehensive.

Q16: Describe the three major weaknesses of this paper:
1. What is its innovation “Describing all the factors that may contributes to NEC due to feeding content and it’s initiation”
2. Lack of discussion “It is now being written broadly.”

Q17: In a review article, the maximum Number of references is 85.
A17: Thank you for your kind reminder, we have decreased our references to 85.

Q18: Please, provide caption for Figure.
A19: Thank you for reminding that, we have provided a caption for our Figure.

Q19: All revised parts must be Highlighted.
A19: Al revised parts are being Highlighted.

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.

Fereshteh Karbasian: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 8 Jan 2021

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should explain why the title of the manuscript is narrative review but its method is similar to systematic review studies.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Jan 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Jan 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.