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-122110
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 13(2) ; e122110

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Quality of Life in Patients with Cystic Fibrosis Regarding Smoking History in Parents"

Author(s): Shabnam Eslampanah, Mohammad Reza Boloorsaz, Ali Akbar Velayati, Maryam Hassanzad, Ali Valinejadi, Hossein Ali Ghaffaripoor, Seyed Alireza Mahdaviani, Noushin Baghaei, Zahra Daneshmandi, Leila Mohammadpour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	27 Dec 2021
Revised Date:	6 Mar 2022
Accepted Date:	12 Mar 2022

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:

Q1: In the research method section, there are no documents about the tools used to assess the quality of life, and it is necessary to mention the method in this section.

R1: Ok, it was revised. Page: 3, Line: 19-27

Reviewer 2:

Q1: In non-inclusion criteria included: age over 30 years and hospitalization in the ICU ,what is determine of age 30 for this assessment ,Is there any reference for it?

R1: Thirty is the age that is considered the age limit in most studies of CF patients. Like this study:

Bucknall T, Bucknall C, Parsons C, Ward K, Legg J, Davies JH. Changes in bone mineral density from age 10 to 30 years in individuals with cystic fibrosis. InEndocrine Abstracts 2018 Oct 18 (Vol. 58). Bioscientifica.

Page: 3 Line: 18

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)