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.109912
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: In Press(In Press); e109912

Peer Review Report for "The Unique Difference Between Serum Level of Soluble Urokinase Plasminogen Activator Receptor (suPAR) in Steroid-Resistant Nephrotic Syndrome Children Treated with an Alkylating Agent and Calcineurin Inhibitors"

Author(s): Ahmedz Widiasta, Kurnia Wahyudi, Husna Nugrahapraja, Yunia Sribudiani, Dedi Rachmadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Oct 2020
Revised Date:	29 Jan 2021
Accepted Date:	7 Feb 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 | Revision (0)

14 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the author:
1) There are lots of published articles that could give information to the reader of the topic such as this study;
a) Evaluation of serum soluble urokinase plasminogen activator receptor as a marker for steroid-responsiveness in children with primary nephrotic syndrome
b) Serum suPAR levels help differentiate steroid resistance from the steroid-sensitive nephrotic syndrome in children
2) Dear author please have a look again at your abstract. There is not enough information in the result section. However result in the section should contain the important body of the abstract, there is only one sentence was written. Please revise the abstract.
3) References were not cited properly, for example, 5-10.
In a method it has been written a retrospective cohort; is that correct?
4) What is the potential risk for alkylating agents or inhibitors of calcineurin?

5) Dear author you have written; Seventy children with the working diagnosis of SRNS (age 1–18 years old) were enrolled in this study. In fact, based on your retrospective survey, you selected those records.
6) In combination with oral Tac of 0.05 mg/kg/day or CPA of 500 – 750 mg/m2/day intravenously. Please give enough information associated with tacrolimus and cyclosporine.
7) For children it is suggested to use boys and girls instead of females and males.
8) Discussion part should be revised in order to focus on the main findings of the study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
I have many questions about this presentation:
- There are grammatical errors related to spelling.
Title:
- It is better to omit “change”
Abstract:
- In the introduction section, “…..evidence with which to distinguish whether the FSGS is within disease activity or not. “Rephrase.
- In the Method section, note the year of research. When?
- In results and conclusion section, is improper and incomplete. PI inserts the main results in relation to the aim of the title.
Introduction:
- Line 2, delete “sRNS”
- We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: UPA, SSNA,…..
“Anotherconducted by Wei et al. (22)……”: DELETE “Anotherconducted by”.
METHODS:
- What are sampling methods?
- Group studies define precise and clear.
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete.
- The main outcome should be based on the aim and title.
- Drugs used must be explained precisely and complete (company, country,…)
- Provide a valid reference for all definitions.
- It is inappropriate to start the sentence with a number (40 mg/m2of….)
Results:
- In table 2 “frequency percent” be corrected.
- PI don’t repeat the sentences no related to this section: fx (A total of 70 children with nephrotic syndrome were included in this study, where 35 received an alkylating agent, and another 35 were given CNIs. The receptor's level was measured at baseline, three months, and six months later.) these were related to the methods section.
Discussion:
- In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) (novelty) at first and then allude to other studies. The discussion was weak and no comparison was made, and in fact, there was no discussion.
- These words should not be mentioned in the text. You should be deleted “table 1, table2,

figure2,…"

- PI don't repeat the sentences no related to this section: line 11-23, discussion section. These were related to the introduction.

Conclusion:

- We would rather write the aim or the title of an article as the first line in the conclusion part, and in the second and third lines we must mention the main(s) finding(s) and for the rest of this part, any gap, question, hypothesis or comment should be declared. The conclusion was so weak.

References:

- PI arrange own base of journal rules.
- References no 13, 16, 38,46, 47, 48 were incomplete.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,

The manuscript needs major revision. Please revise the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 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.

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for your valuable inputs, I've revise the manuscript according to your advice.

Herewith I send you the revised notes:

Title:

"The unique difference between serum level of soluble urokinase plasminogen activator receptor (suPAR) in steroid-resistant nephrotic syndrome children treated with alkylating agent and calcineurin inhibitors"

No	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
	Q: Dear author there are lots of published articles that could give information to the reader of the topic such as this study: R: I have added several articles supporting suPAR examination in SRNS, these studies did not compare SRNS treated therapy with CNIs and alkylating agents. These studies also still have controversy between studies. Q: Evaluation of serum soluble urokinase plasminogen activator receptor as a marker for steroid-responsiveness in children with primary nephrotic syndrome	Q: There are grammatical errors related to spelling. A: I have fixed it with the help of a native English proofreader Q: Title: It is better omit "change" A: I have removed the word "change" in the title (Title) Q: Abstract: In introduction section, "…..evidence with which to distinguish whether the FSGS is within disease activity or not. "Rephrase.

	A: I have cited this research (line 55) Q: Serum suPAR levels help differentiate steroid resistance from steroid-sensitive nephrotic syndrome in children A: I have cited this research Q: Dear author please have a look again to your abstract. There is not enough information in the result section. However result section should contain the important body of abstract, there is only one sentence was written. Please revise the abstract. A: I have revised the abstract, adding the highlights in the results section. I also fixed the introductory part so that it is sharper. (line 17) Q:References were not sited properly, for example 5-10. A: I have checked the references again, so that they match the contents. I have corrected the writing of imperfect references. Q: Method: retrospective cohort A:this is true, I have corrected the sentence so it doesn't confuse the reader. (line 71, 78) \	A: This sentence I have paraphrased (line 9-10) Q: In Method section, note the year of research. When? A: (line 71, 78, 79) Data collected at July 2020, from medical records of the patients between July 2019 – July 2020 → I have written time so that it can be easily recognized by readers Q: In results and conclusion section, is improper and incomplete. Pl inserts the main results in relation to aim of title. A: I have completed the results and conclusion, so that it is related to the research objectives (line 173-179) Q: Introduction: Line 2, delete “sRNS” A: I have changed it as recommended by the reviewer Q: We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: UPA, SSNA,….. A: I have corrected it so that there is no abbreviation before the definition in the first sentence. (line 25)

	Q: What is the potential risk for alkylating agents or inhibitors of calcineurin? A:I have added the risks of giving CNIs and Alkylating agents in the methods and discussion section (line 96-98) Q; Dear author you have written; Seventy children with the working diagnosis of SRNS (age 1–18 years old) were enrolled in this study. In fact based on your retrospective survey, you selected those records A: I have revised this statement: the study was a retrospective cohort of medical records. (line 78-81) Q: In combination with oral Tac of 0.05 mg/kg/day or CPA of 500 – 750 mg/m2/day intravenously. Please give enough information associated with tacrolimus and cyclosporine. A:I have added more complete information about the dosage of CPA, Tac, and Cyclosporine A in the discussion and methods section (line 90-93) Q:For children it is suggested to use boys and girls instead females and males A:I have fixed the table (table 1, line 115, 226, 228) Q: Discussion part should be revise in order to focus on the main findings of the study.	Q: “Anotherconducted by Wei et al. (22)……” : DELETE “Anotherconducted by”. A: I have deleted it Q: METHODS: What is sampling methods? A: The sample was collected by July 2020 from the consecutive data sampling between July 2019 – July 2020. Q: Groups studies define precise and clearly. A: I have explained it in the method section (line 71-75) Q:Inclusion and exclusion criteria were incomplete. A: I have explained it in the method section (line 79-87) Q: Main outcome should be based the aim and title. A: I have adjusted it in the introduction and discussion section (line 11,12, 62-65) Q: Drugs used must be explained precise and complete (company, country,…)

	A:I have improved the discussion section so that it is more systematic and complete, and focuses on main findings. (line 173-271)	A: I have detailed Tac, Cyc, and CPA in the introduction, method, and discussion sections Q: Provide a valid reference for all definitions. A: I have made a valid reference for each definition (line 90-94) Q: It is inappropriate to start the sentence with a number (40 mg/m2of….) A: I have changed it according to reviewer suggestions Q: In table 2 “frequency percent” be corrected. A: I have changed it according to reviewer suggestions (table 2) Q: Pl don’t repeat the sentences no related to this section: fx (A total of 70 children with the nephrotic syndrome were included in this study, where 35 received an alkylating agent, and another 35 were given CNIs. The receptor's level was measured at baseline, three months, and six months later.) these were related to methods section. A: I have changed it according to reviewer suggestions Q: In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) (novelty) at first and then allude to other studies. The discussion was weak and no comparison was made, and in fact there was no discussion. A: I have completed the discussion section, plus some literature

		on related previous studies. Discussion of why there is a gap between this study and previous research. (line 173-217) Q: These words should not be mentioned in the text. You should be deleted “table 1, table2, figure2,…” A: I have fixed it (within discussion section) Q: Pl don’t repeat the sentences no related to this section: line 11-23,discussion A: I have fixed the repeated sentences Q: Conclusion: We would rather to write the aim or the title of an article as the first line in conclusion part, and in the second and third lines we must mention the main(s) finding(s) and for the rest of this part , any gap, question, hypothesis or comment should be declared. Conclusion was so weak. A: I have improved it, so that the discussion is more and contains important things in this study with related previous research. (line 173-179, and the explanation about the gap until line 217) Q: References: Pl arrange on base of journal rules. References no 13, 16, 38,46, 47, 48 were incomplete.

		A: I have reviewed the references, the incomplete I have completed, the inappropriate ones I have issued (line 281-505)

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) 24 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
I thank the authors for all their efforts to publish scientific manuscripts to expand public knowledge. But some points mentioned have not been changed by the authors.
Abstract:
- Please have a look again at your abstract and revise that. The introduction section (in the abstract) is too long. PI notes the main related points. There is not enough information in the result section. However, the result section should contain the important body of the abstract.
In results and conclusion section (in the abstract), is incomplete, yet. PI insert the main results in relation to the aim of the title.
Patients and methods:
- In the Outcome variables section: “cystitis hemorrhagic” changes to “hemorrhagic cystitis” and also, Please insert “nocturia, enuresis” following hemorrhagic cystitis. “The potential side effects were hemorrhagic cystitis, nocturia, enuresis, amenorrhea, delayed puberty, blood dyscrasia, AKI, and hypertension (8,48,49,…)”. You should be mentioned and added this valuable reference (Efficacy of desmopressin in the treatment of nocturia in elderly men. J Res Med Sci. 2011 Apr;16(4):516-23. PMID: 22091268; PMCID: PMC3214357).
Discussion:
- Page 17, paragraph 3, line 15: “… systitis,” change to “… cystitis”.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Jan 2021

Dear author
Please revise the manuscript based on comments.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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 reviewer,

Thank you for your valuable inputs, I've revised the manuscript according to your advice.

Herewith I send you the revised notes:

Q: *Please have a look again to your abstract and revise that. Introduction section (in abstract) is too long. Pl notes the main related points. There is not enough information in the result section. However result section should contain the important body of abstract.*
In results and conclusion section (in abstract), is incomplete, yet. Pl inserts the main results in relation to aim of title.

A: I have revised at line 6-8 (Introduction) , and 15-21 (Results and conclusion)

Q: Patients and methods:
In Outcome variables section: "cystitis hemorrhagic" changes to "hemorrhagic cystitis" and also, Please insert "nocturia, enuresis" following of hemorrhagic cystitis. "The potential side effects were hemorrhagic cystitis, nocturia, enuresis, amenorrhea, delayed puberty, blood dyscrasia, AKI, and hypertension (8,48,49,…)". You should be mentioned and added this valuable reference (Efficacy of desmopressin in treatment of nocturia in elderly men. J Res Med Sci. 2011 Apr;16(4):516-23. PMID: 22091268; PMCID: PMC3214357).
Discussion:
Page 17, paragraph 3, line 15: "… systitis," change to "… cystitis".

A: I have revised at line 99-100

Thank you for your kindness.

Best regards,

Authors

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 2 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
I thank you for all your efforts to publish scientific manuscripts to expand public knowledge. All points mentioned have been changed by authors. The manuscript is now acceptable and printable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 7 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 Feb 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.