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.111394
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 13(1) ; e111394

Peer Review Report for "Unusual Presentation of Pulmonary Interstitial Glycogenosis: A Case Report Study"

Author(s): Negarin Seyyedirad, Ali Ahani Azari, Lobat Shahkar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	30 Jun 2021
Revised Date:	13 Oct 2021
Accepted Date:	10 Nov 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

17 Sep 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

This case report is very educational and I highly recommend its publication but there are many issues before publication:

1. There are so many inappropriate diagnostic work up which performed in this case. It seem that the table of differential diagnosis was reviewed and many appropriate and inappropriate diagnostic modalities were selected for him. For example what is the role of barium study or hepatitis work up in this patient?
2. The "case presentation" segment is not prepared professionally. For example this sentence is not academic: "The boy did not have any cyanosis and familial disease, and his intra partum Echocardiography was normal."

3. After performing CXR and chest CTs why they continue to request many unrelated diagnostic evaluations?!

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.

Abstract:
1-Line 1: Children should be written in lower case not in capital.

According to the reviewer's comment this section has been revised and highlighted by yellow color.

2-Line 2: "This is unique to neonates and infants" maybe better to write that is limited exclusively to neonates and infants. "Unique" is not appropriate here.

According to the reviewer's comment this section has been revised and highlighted in manuscript.

2-The Keywords should be written according to the MeSH terms.

According to the reviewer's comment all key words have been revised according to MeSH and highlighted in manuscript.

Background:
The English should be revised all over the manuscript.

According to the reviewer's comment the English has been revised by a new native English person in all parts of article.

Authors should pay attention to the abbreviations, English writing and try not to repeat the words, eg: line 2 in background, "unique" should be corrected as I mentioned for the abstract, and "Pig" should be written as PIG.

According to the reviewer's comment these sections have been revised.

Case presentation:
Authors should not expose the final diagnosis in the first line here. They should start with the chief complaint, then physical exam, history, diagnosis process and then the final diagnosis.
We do not use "pic" to address the figure.
According to the reviewer's comments, case presentation has been revised. The words "Pic" have changed to the "Fig"

Discussion:
The English writing should be revised.
The last paragraph should show the main message of the manuscript, but it is a large sentence with no key-message.

According to the reviewer's comments these sections have been revised.

References:
Some references are not complete, page numbers, issue and volume are not written.

Just first reference is an E-book and does not have volume. Reference 8th has been revised and volume is added.

Figure 3 is shown earlier that others, that should be corrected.
Tables should have footnotes that noted with symbols in the table.

I uploaded the figures in journal site respectively. I think it is the problem of site when we want to upload the figures and I think the journal will solve this problem in publishing time.
I have underestood from your comment that I have to put symbols and introduce the abbreviations with them. If you have other point of view about symbols please tell us for further revision.

In addition in the table I eliminated some facts which I mentioned in the manuscript before, for example I mentioned the results of sonography, and echocardiography were normal, but I put these facts in the table again.

Generally, I could say that with the revision, this is an interesting case and could be interesting for the readers too.

Best

Reviewer 2:
Dear Sir/Madam

This case report is very educational and I highly recommend its publication but there are many issues before publication:
1. There are so many inappropriate diagnostic work up which performed in this case. It seem that the table of differential diagnosis was reviewed and many appropriate and inappropriate diagnostic modalities were selected for him. For example what is the role of barium study or hepatitis work up in this patient?

As you know the PIG is a rare case, and our case did not have common features of PIG.
In this regard we had to explore much more probable differential diagnosis and also in agreement with you we have accepted maybe some differential diagnosis are much less common (.i.e. acute hepatitis, celiac, Wegner and…) and we did over diagnosis. In this reason we decided to omit these parts from manuscript and table to prevent confusion for readers in future.

2. The "case presentation" segment is not prepared professionally. For example, this sentence is not academic: "The boy did not have any cyanosis and familial disease, and his intra partum Echocardiography was normal."

This section has been revised.

3. After performing CXR and chest CTs why they continue to request many unrelated diagnostic evaluations?!

We answered to this question in Q2. But here I added some extra reasons. As we mentioned in manuscript, after CXR and CT results, there were a lot of overlap between symptoms of numerous diseases. For example, in the CT and CXR of alpha anti trypsin deficiency (AAT), we had these evidences similar to PIG. In this regard we had to examine the level of AAT in further workup. As I mentioned in the manuscript, the diagnosis of PIG will confirm just with pulmonary biopsy.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer

26 Sep 2021

Dear Editor of Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Thank you for providing me the edited file of this manuscript.

I read the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments and checked the highlighted corrections in the main text. It seems that the requested editions are done properly and it could be accepted in the present form.
Although I may suggest some additional points to be corrected before the final decision:
1-Authors may add "a case report" to the title.
2-There should not be references cited in the abstract.
3-Reference citation should be started from "Introduction" section.
4-When referring to a figure, authors should write (figure...) not (fig...).
5-In "case presentation" section: line 2, what does reference (3) mean? They are describing the case, not referring to another study.

Best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer

4 Oct 2021

Thanks for your co-operation in revising the manuscript.
The changes were acceptable.
Please change the " interesting PIG case" to for example "educational case " or something like this. (line 166)

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 **Editor-in-Chief**

Thank you for this email. We performed some changes based on the reviewers' comments.
These changes are highlighted in the manuscript.

Best regards
Dr.L.Shahkar

Pediatric assistant professor in pulmonary department of GOUMS

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your co-operation in revising the manuscript.
The changes were acceptable.
Please change the " interesting PIG case" to for example "educational case " or something like this. (line 166)

According to the reviewer's comment this change has been done (line 161).

Reviewer 2:
Dear Editor of Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Thank you for providing me the edited file of this manuscript.

I read the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments and checked the highlighted corrections in the main text. It seems that the requested editions are done properly and it could be accepted in the present form.
Although I may suggest some additional points to be corrected before the final decision:

1-Authors may add "a case report" to the title.

According to the reviewer's comment this change has been done.

2-There should not be references cited in the abstract.

According to reviewer's comment, these references have been omitted.

3-Reference citation should be started from "Introduction" section.

According to reviewer’s comment, we edited this mistake.

4-When referring to a figure, authors should write (figure...) not (fig...).

According to reviewer’s comment, these sections have been changed and highlighted in manuscript and also edited in the figures subtitles (lines 52, 64, 68).

5-In "case presentation" section: line 2, what does reference (3) mean? They are describing the case, not referring to another study.

This reference describes the staging of clubbing, but because we cited to this reference in the following (line 72), so I deleted it in line 2 of case presentation (line 51).

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Reviewer

9 Nov 2021

Dear Editor of Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

This version of the manuscript is OK, from my point of view.

Thank you