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 "**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:

Peer Review

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/compreped.109316
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(1) ; e109316

Peer Review Report for "The Prevalence of Neonate Resuscitation and Some Related Factors in an Academic Center in the North of Iran"

Author(s): Mandana Mansour Ghanaie, Zahra Rafiei Sorouri, Farnoush Farzi, Gelareh Biazar, Reyhaneh Shahrokhi Rad, Mohadese Ahmadi, Elahe Rafiee, Parisa Haghi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	11 Sep 2020
Revised Date:	23 Nov 2020
Accepted Date:	26 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.

REFEREE : Reviewer

17 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable research. Following are my suggested comments aiming to improve the study design.
- Obviously in this research it was not possible to evaluate all the factors that could influence the need for NR, so it is better than the title changes to some related factors.
- The manuscripts need to be revised by someone expert in English.
- In the abstract section, the material& method and result sections should be presented more completely.
- Keywords should be revised, related factors seem to be better than risk factors.

- For the first time, CS and other abbreviations should be written completely in the text.
- Please explain completely about the characteristics of your hospital.
- The year of the study should be noted in the text.
- Included and excluded criteria are not clear.
- What do you mean the medical student was trained both theoretically and practically?
- Please add more references from 2020.
- Finally, the data were analyzed by SPSS version 21, this sentence has been repeated in statistics and should omit it from the method section.
- Please point to the novelty and strengths of this research.
- Please improve the title and explanations of the tables.

Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer 10 Nov 2020

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

REFEREE : Associate Editor 13 Nov 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE : EIC 13 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

Dear EIC
Thanks for the review process. We did our best to revise the manuscript according to the valuable comments of the respected reviewers.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear authors, thanks for your valuable research. Following are my suggested comments aiming to improve the study design.

Obviously in this research it was not possible to evaluate all the factors that could influence the need for NR, so it is better that the title changes to some related factors.

Done and highlighted in the text.
The manuscript needs to be revised by someone expert in English.

Done and highlighted in the text.

In abstract section the material& method and result sections should be presented more completely.

Done and highlighted in the text.

Key words should be revised, related factors seems to be better than risk factors

Done and highlighted in the text.

For the first time, CS and other abbreviations should be written completely in the text.

Done and highlighted in the text.

Please explain completely about the characteristics of your hospital.

Done and highlighted in the text.

The year of the study should be noted in the text.

Done and highlighted in the text.

Included and excluded criteria are not clear.

Done and highlighted in the text

What do you mean the medical student was trained both theoretically and practically?

We mean that the medical student who was responsible to extract the data was completely informed about the new NR algorithms and the practical aspect.

Please add more references from 2020.

Done

Finally, the data were analyzed by SPSS version 21, this sentence has been repeated in statistics and should omit it from method section

Done.

Please point to your novelty and strengths of this research.

It was the first study investigating the topic in this academic and referral hospital in Guilan province.

Please improve the title and explanations of the tables.
Done

Best regards

Gelareh Biazar MD

Reviewer 2:
ok

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript needs major revision.

EIC Decision:

Major revision

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 25 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for the valuable work. I peered at the revised section and fortunately, all the comments have been considered.
Regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 26 Nov 2020

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

REFEREE : EIC — 26 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.