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.118566
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(3) ; e118566

Peer Review Report for "Maternal Attitude Towards Cell Phone Use During Pregnancy; A Potential Harm to the Fetus"

Author(s): Gelareh Biazar, Ali Mohammadzadeh Jouryabi, Vali Imantalab, Zahra Atrkar Roushan, Yasmin Chaibakhsh, Zahra Mirmoazen, Haniyeh Sadat Fayazi, Fazilat Nojumi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Aug 2021
Revised Date:	20 Aug 2021
Accepted Date:	28 Aug 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

15 Aug 2021

Dear AE
Thanks for your kind invitation. Following are my comments.
1. The title could be presented in a more informative form.
2. The abbreviated form of the phrases should begin from the abstract section, not the introduction.
3. Is there similar research in Iran? Please point to them, all your references are from other countries.
4. Why didn't you evaluate the harmfulness of cell phone radiation on fetuses? It could be a stronger work.

5. CS cases are in your inclusion criteria, it seems that only elective cases could be interviewed, not emergence ones with poor cooperation.
6. The characteristics of the hospital should be explained in more detail.
7. The data presented in Table 2 have not been discussed.
8. Please remake the tables
9. Please revise the paper in terms of grammatical defects.
Best Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer

15 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
It was my pleasure to review of this manuscript, There are some comments for the authors:
-Method section of the abstract section should be completed.
-Keywords should be revised based on MESH
-In the introduction section more evidence regarding the potential risk of cell phone radiation should be presented, in other words, the necessity of planning this paper could be shown more clearly.
-At the end of the introduction section, you have pointed to several studies, so more than one reference should be inserted.
-Correlation in the text should be replaced by association.
-It is vague :“which is similar to general anesthetics related neurotoxicity in developing brain during pregnancy” please explain what did you mean? What is the relationship between mobile phones and GA toxicity?
-It was better if the authors evaluated the harmful effects of mobile phones rather than the maternal attitude.
-Please add a section for statistical analysis.
-In the discussion section, no comparison has been done.
-The conclusion should present the main results, which is not currently seem
Thanks

REFEREE : Associate Editor

16 Aug 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

16 Aug 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 EIC Prof. Boloursaz

First of all, I wish you and your dear colleagues good health in this crisis and hectic days. Thanks for the review process. We did our best to revise the manuscript according to the respected authors' comments wishing be suitable to being published in your prestigious journal.

Warm Regards

Gelareh Biazar M.D

Reviewer 1:

-Method section of the abstract section should be completed.

Thanks, done and highlighted in the text.
-Keywords should be revised based on MESH
Thanks, done and highlighted in the text.

-In the introduction section more evidence regarding the potential risk of cell phone radiation should be presented, in other words, the necessity of planning this paper could be shown more clearly.

This section has been revised.
-At the end of the introduction section, you have pointed to several studies, so more than one reference should be inserted.

Two new references have been added.

-Correlation in the text should be replaced by association.

Done

-It is vague :"which is similar to general anesthetics related neurotoxicity in developing brain during pregnancy" please explain what did you mean? What is the relationship between mobile phones and GA toxicity?

More explanation has been provided.

-It was better if the authors evaluated the harmful effects of mobile phones rather than the maternal attitude.

Thanks, Definitely planning a cohort study and investigation the harmful effects of mobile use during pregnancy on fetus would be worth full as a number of previous studies have addressed this issue. However considering of the lack of no similar work in Iran and based on

the alarming results of the current evidence the idea for this study was created. In this paper as the first step we aimed to determine the status of mobile use during pregnancy in women admitted to an academic referral center and their attitude towards the vulnerability of the developing fetus to mobile radiation . On the other hand several barriers exists in human studies *as we* can not asses other risk factors such as chromosomal abnormalities, maternal co-morbidities, or other environmental harmful exposures. Obviously socioeconomic and nutritional status could be influencing factors on child's development .Moreover it should be noted that it could not be claimed that cell-phone is the only source of EMF. On the whole this title was chosen but we will design further researches in future investigating the possible harmful effects of cell-phones on pregnancy outcomes and fetus.

-Please add a section for statistical analysis.

Done

-In the discussion section, no comparison has been done.

Searching the literature ,no similar study has evaluated maternal attitude towards cell phone risks on fetus. Although indicating the novelty of the work ,challenging comparison would be impossible. We have pointed to the issue as a limitation.

-The conclusion should present the main results, which is not currently seem

Done

Thanks

Reviewer 2:

1.The title could be presented in a more informative form.

Done

2.The abbreviated form of the phrases should begin from abstract section not introduction.

Done

3.Is there a similar research in Iran? Please point to them, all your references are from other countries.

We could find two articles and added.

4.Why didn't you evaluate the harmfulness of cell-phone radiation on fetus? It could be a stronger work.

Thanks, Definitely planning a cohort study and investigation the harmful effects of mobile use during pregnancy on fetus would be worth full as a number of previous studies have

addressed this issue. However considering of the lack of no similar work in Iran and based on the alarming results of the current evidence the idea for this study was created. In this paper as the first step we aimed to determine the status of mobile use during pregnancy in women admitted to an academic referral center and their attitude towards the vulnerability of the developing fetus to mobile radiation . On the other hand several barriers exists in human studies *as we* can not asses other risk factors such as chromosomal abnormalities, maternal co-morbidities, or other environmental harmful exposures. Obviously socioeconomic and nutritional status could be influencing factors on child's development .Moreover it should be noted that it could not be claimed that cell-phone is the only source of EMF. On the whole this title was chosen but we will design further researches in future investigating the possible harmful effects of cell-phones on pregnancy outcomes and fetus.

5.CS cases are in your inclusion criteria, it seems that only elective cases could be interviewed, not emergence ones with poor cooperation.

Of course elective CS cases are not candidate any longer and NVD should be considered firstly. The enrolled women were not elective CS but candidate for CS due to the specific indications in stable status. Emergence cases such as vasa previa did not enroll the survey.

6.The characteristics of the hospital should be explained with more details.

Done

7.The data presented by table 2 have not been discussed.

Done

8.Please remake the tables

Done

9.Please revise the paper in terms of grammatical defects.

Done

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 21 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
All the recommendations have been considered by the respected authors.
Warm Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 21 Aug 2021

Dear AE
In my idea, the manuscript has been revised acceptable.
Best regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 28 Aug 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE : EIC — 28 Aug 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.