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.109904
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(2); e109904

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Microalbuminuria and Glycosylated Hemoglobin in the Assessment of Diabetes Control in Children with Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus Hospitalized with Diabetic Ketoacidosis"

Author(s): Saiprasad Onkareshwar Kavthekar, Vijay Tukaram Mali, Sachin Verma, Anil Bapurao Kurane, Nivedita Balasaheb Patil, Suhas Panditrao Kulkarni

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Oct 2020
Revised Date:	21 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	10 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

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

Chandrashekhar Dnyandeo Aundhkar: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 7 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Keywords – The sequence of keywords is different on page 1 & page 2
- Microalbuminuriais is the first keyword but there is no table for Microalbuminuriai and levels of A1C Haemoglobin
- There is notable for the duration of diabetes and Microalbuminuriai.
- Conclusion on page no 2 and page no 9 is different
- There are 16 references of more than 5 years duration
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 14 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:

1) Primary and secondary objectives should be made clear and mention what is Novelty in this study
2) To include newer definations and terminologies
3) In methodology to highlight about tests adopted, sensitivity and specificity,and detailed methodology
4) to include tables relevant to the study
5) to mention about the limitations of the study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs major revision. The authors should revise the manuscript based on reviewers comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Jan 2021

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.

Reviewer No.	Reviewer's Comment	Response
Reviewer 1	Key words – Sequence of key words is different on page 1 & page 2	Comment addressed. Sequence of the key words have been corrected and made same on both the pages.
	Microalbuminuria is first key word but there is no table for Microalbuminuria and levels of A1C Haemoglobin	Comment addressed. Table have been added in the result section
	There is no table for duration of diabetes and Microalbuminuria.	Comment addressed. Table have been added in the result section
	Conclusion on page no 2 and page no 9 is different	Comment addressed. Same Conclusions have been re-written on both the pages.
	There are 16 references more than 5 years duration	Comment addressed. All the old references have been cited by the latest ones.
Reviewer 2	Primary and secondary objectives should be made clear and mention what is the Novelty in this study	Comment addressed. Primary and secondary objectives have been made clear and novelty has also been mentioned.
	To include newer definitions and terminologies	Comment addressed. newer definitions and terminologies have been included.
	In methodology to highlight about tests adopted, sensitivity and specificity and detailed methodology	Comment addressed. Tests adopted have been highlighted with detailed methodology.
	to include tables relevant to the study	Comment Addressed. Relevant tables have been included.

	to mention about the limitations of the study	Comment addressed. Limitations of the study have been mentioned.

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) — 11 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
I Satisfied with the relevant changes made by the author.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 25 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The authors have made the corrections as per previous review comments... introduction, methodology, Results, Discussion, references...are satisfactory.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 10 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 10 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
This article is accepted for publication.
Thanks.