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.116666
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 13(1) ; e116666

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Parents' Education on the Prevalence of Acute Leukemia in Children"

Author(s): Mohammad Kajiyazdi, Mohsen Jafari, Kambiz Eftekhari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	13 Jun 2021
Revised Date:	11 Jul 2021
Accepted Date:	28 Oct 2021

Revision (0)

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

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1

Dear author

This study is an interesting and valuable study and so far limited studies have been done in this regard.

Dear reviewer

Thank you for your kindness.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editor in Chief

Thank you for choosing me as the reviewer of the manuscript entitled “The effect of parents' education on the prevalence of acute leukemia in children”.

Dear reviewer

Thank you for your attention, very good and practical comments.

1. Some points about the manuscript in this study, except for the level of education of parents, the factors affecting the development of leukemia were not questioned. Given that parents have not received specific training on leukemia predisposing factors, it is not easy to conclude that a higher level of education is effective in leukemia prevention.
   There are two main factors involved in the development of malignancy: genetic and environmental. Environmental risk factors include ionizing radiation, non-ionizing radiation, hydrocarbons, pesticides, alcohol, cigarettes, and illicit drug use.
   In our study, environmental risk factors were the same in both groups. The subjects were the same in terms of cancer type and assessments of environmental risk factors.

2. References: inadequate for original article.

   There are very limited studies on the effect of parents' education on the prevalence of acute leukemia in children.

3. The style of reference should be corrected according to Comp J of Pediatric instruction

   References were modified based on the format of the journal.

4. Ref no 5, 9, 10, 11 should be corrected.

   These references were corrected.

5. It is appropriate as a “letter to editor”

   If possible, we would like this article to be published in the original article format.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)