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.109539
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(4) ; e109539

Peer Review Report for "Causes of Neonatal Jaundice Requiring Exchange Transfusion"

Author(s): mohammad hossein Boskabadi, Gholamali Maamouri, Maryam abbasi, Elahe Heidari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	19 Sep 2020
Revised Date:	3 Aug 2021
Accepted Date:	16 Aug 2021

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

4 May 2021

I totally appreciate the efforts that have been done by the authors in conducting this interesting study but I have many questions about this presentation:

The manuscript need totally revision and paraphrases (English grammars).
There is no standardization for some words throughout the text (for example: (%) or [%] in the text, especially in discussion section)
We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: BG, G6PD,...

Title:
Title should be revised. “Causes of Neonatal Jaundice which Requiring Exchange

Transfusion”

Abstract:
Subsections must be arranged according to the rules of the journal. (Background, objective, methods, results and conclusion)
We are not allowed to use any abbreviation of year (2020)
What is the mean “others causes”. According to aim of study, others must be define precisely and clear.

Key words:
All keywords (3-5, according to the journal rules) should be provided according to the MeSH terms. The preferred expression is indicated by the label "MeSH Heading" and not "Entry Term.

Introduction:
Paragraph 1 need rephrase, totally.
Line 1, paragraph 1, “disease” must be deleted. Hyper-bilirubinemia is not diseases. This is a manifestation or expression of some diseases.
Reference 4 is too old (2006). In first or second paragraph of introduction, at first, Pl briefly explain the main causes of neonatal jaundice (breastfeeding and non-breastfeeding jaundice) and then explain the causes of the non-physiologic or non-breastfeeding jaundice. For example you can write: “Neonatal jaundice is divided into two important causes: breastfeeding and non- breastfeeding jaundice. The most important non- breastfeeding jaundice causes are blood group incompatibility,.....”. You should be mentioned this new and valuable reference in background and/or discussion section (Risk Factors of Early Breastfeeding Jaundice: How Can Gynecologists and Nurses be Effective in Reducing It?, J Compr Ped. 2020 ; 11(3):e103578. doi: 10.5812/compreped.103578.)
The rationale of the study should be explained in a more detailed way in the last paragraph of the introduction section. Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? Which new question does the findings of this study answer?
Methods:
Paragraph 1 needs revision and paraphrase totally.(especially line 1-3).
How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula? Explain it.
Ethic approval code must be moved to first paragraph and delete title of study.
In paragraph 3, repetitive sentences must be omitted (year, sampling methods,...).
Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete. Pl defines precisely and clearly.
Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be move to first paragraph.
Positive direct Coombs test indirect Coombs test?. Note which was for babies and mothers?
What were the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test? You explain which parametric or non-parametric tests were used for which variables? defines precisely and clearly.

Results:
Omit repetitive sentences (year).

Paragraph 1, must be move to methods section (participants included in the study?) and rephrases.
Paragraph 1, 172 infants?!!!
Paragraph 2, 245 babies?!!! In methods section you notice 251 babies. Do you have missing data?
Paragraph 5, must be moved to methods section (explanation of “others”).
You forgive the total serum bilirubin level in neonates who received exchange transfusion (mean and SD).
It is better to create one or more tables and summaries this section. The contents of the tables should not be repeated in the text. Instead, a reference to the table number may be given.

Discussion:
When you use author et al, mention citing reference in front of name (for example: Badi'i et al (14),
Paragraph 4, (15-12) change to (12-15).
Paragraph 5 need references.
References:
The most of references were too old (before 2011). There have been only 3 references from 2015 onwards.
Best regards

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”

Q1:The manuscript need totally revision and paraphrases (English grammars).
A1: Done it is highlighted with color gray

Q2: There is no standardization for some words throughout the text (for example: (%) or [%] in the text, especially in discussion section)
A2: It is done

Q3:We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: BG, G6PD,...
A3:It is corrected

Title:
Q4:Title should be revised. “Causes of Neonatal Jaundice which Requiring Exchange Transfusion”
A4: Done

Abstract:
Q5: Subsections must be arranged according to the rules of the journal. (Background, objective, methods, results and conclusion)
A5: Done

Q6: We are not allowed to use any abbreviation of year (2020)
A6: It is corrected

Q7:What is the mean “others causes”. According to aim of study, others must be define precisely and clear.

A7: The word "other causes" was omitted from the abstract and explained in detail in the body of the manuscript.

Key words:
Q8: All keywords (3-5, according to the journal rules) should be provided according to the MeSH terms. The preferred expression is indicated by the label "MeSH Heading" and not "Entry Term. A8: Done

Introduction:
Q9:Paragraph 1 need rephrase, totally.

A9: English editing is done

Q10:Line 1, paragraph 1, "disease" must be deleted. Hyper-bilirubinemia is not diseases. This is a manifestation or expression of some diseases.
A10: Done

Q11:Reference 4 is too old (2006).
A11: Reference four was replaced by a newer reference

Q12: In first or second paragraph of introduction, at first, Pl briefly explain the main causes of neonatal jaundice (breastfeeding and non- breastfeeding jaundice) and then explain the causes of the non-physiologic or non-breastfeeding jaundice. For example you can write: "Neonatal jaundice is divided into two important causes: breastfeeding and non- breastfeeding jaundice. The most important non- breastfeeding jaundice causes are blood group incompatibility,……".
A12: The most common causes of hyperbilirubinemia have been added in the body of manuscript

Q13: You should be mentioned this new and valuable reference in background and/or discussion section (Risk Factors of Early Breastfeeding Jaundice: How Can Gynecologists and Nurses be Effective in Reducing It?, J Compr Ped. 2020 ; 11(3):e103578. doi: 10.5812/compreped.103578.)
A13: Done

Q14:The rationale of the study should be explained in a more detailed way in the last paragraph of the introduction section. Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again? Which new question does the findings of this study answer?

A13: It is added and highlighted in the body of manuscript:

Many surveys have studied the causes of neonatal jaundice risk factors, but fewer studies have suggested the causes of jaundice requiring blood exchange, most of which were small in sample size and failed to show the less common causes. *In this study we examined this important issue in the Iranian community with a sample size of more than two hundred term and preterm neonates, which is almost unique in term of sample size.*

Methods:
Q14;Paragraph 1 needs revision and paraphrase totally.(especially line 1-3).

A14: Done

Q15;How did you calculate the sample size? Which formula? Explain it.
A15:
In order to determine the sample size, based on a study conducted by Bayat Mokhtari et al (10) on the causes of exchange transfusion , using the following formula and considering the mean of the minimum and maximum prevalence the sample size was calculated at 250 subjects. Alpha and beta errors were considered 0.05 and 0.2, respectively.

$$N=Z^2Pq/D^2$$

Q16:Ethic approval code must be moved to first paragraph and delete title of study.
A16: Done

Q17:In paragraph 3, repetitive sentences must be omitted (year, sampling methods,...)
A17:.Done

Q18:Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete. Pl defines precisely and clearly.
Inclusions and exclusions criteria must be move to first paragraph.
A18: It is done

Q19;Positive direct Coombs test indirect Coombs test?. Note which was for babies and mothers?
A19:Both are about neonates. It is highlighted in the method part

Q20:What were the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test? You explain which parametric or non-parametric tests were used for which variables? defines precisely and clearly.

A20: Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to examine the distribution of weight, age of referral, total bilirubin and hematocrit. Hematocrit has a normal distribution and other variables do not have a normal distribution.

Results:
Q21:Omit repetitive sentences (year).
A21:Done

Q22:Paragraph 1, must be move to methods section (participants included in the study?) and rephrases.
A22: Done

Q23:Paragraph 1, 172 infants?!!!
Paragraph 2, 245 babies?!!! In methods section you notice 251 babies. Do you have missing data?
A23:
In total, 272 infants who had received exchange transfusion were included in the study. However, 18 infants were excluded since their gestational age was less than 34 weeks. Moreover, 3 infants were excluded from the study since they had received exchange transfusion for reasons other than jaundice. Finally, 251 cases were included in the study.

Q24: Paragraph 5, must be moved to methods section (explanation of "others").
A24: done

Q25:You forgive the total serum bilirubin level in neonates who received exchange transfusion (mean and SD).
A25: The mean and standard deviation of the total serum bilirubin level in neonates who received exchange transfusion were 27/53±10/05 mg/dL

Q26:It is better to create one or more tables and summaries this section. The contents of the tables should not be repeated in the text. Instead, a reference to the table number may be given.
A26:Due to the fact that the results section is summarized, we mentioned the results in the body of manuscript.

Discussion:
Q27:When you use author et al, mention citing reference in front of name (for example: Badi'i et al (14),
A27: Done

Q28:Paragraph 4, (15-12) change to (12-15).

A28:Done

Q29:Paragraph 5 need references.
A29:Paragraph five, is the authors' interpretation of the results obtained in this study

References:
Q30:The most of references were too old (before 2011). There have been only 3 references from 2015 onwards.
A30:We omitted a reference wich was too old, and added two newer references

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer

12 Aug 2021

I reviewed the manuscript, again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated.
I think this manuscript advances health care worldwide by sharing knowledge and expertise to improve experiences, outcome and value.
Thank you