**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.111960
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(2); e111960

# Peer Review Report for "Associated Etiologies of Enuresis in 5-to-15-Year-Old-Children"

**Author(s):** Simin Sadeghi-Bojd, Mahboube Firouzkouhi Moghaddam, Elham Sharafkhani, Seyed Hosein Soleimanzadeh Mousavi, Saeedeh Yaghoubi

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 7 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 14 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.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- The date of performance is not the same in the abstract and full section
- In method: what is NME and MNE
- Write the statistical analysis in full details
- Consider grammatical error
- Please write some about the study limitation.

Thanks.

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

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

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision (0)** 10 Jan 2021

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

Reply:

1- The year has corrected
2- MNE is correct and mean Monosymptomatic Nocturnal Enuresis
3- All the statistical analysis has shown in table 1 and in results. If there was any unclearity please let me know.

Thanks

**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) 19 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript has many grammatical errors and needs some logical corrections.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,
The manuscript needs serious english editing.
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.

Reply:

All the grammatical mistakes have corrected.

Thanks

**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) 12 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
thanks for choosing me as the reviewer. All the parts of the article were perfect and the topic choice was good.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 14 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 14 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
It's accepted for publication.
Thanks.