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-130127
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 13(4) ; e130127

Peer Review Report for "The Novel Method of Teaching Physiology and Pathophysiology of Congenital Hypothyroidism to Medical Students: An Educational Intervention Study"

Author(s): Afagh Hassanzadeh Rad, Maryam Shahrokhi, Shahin Koohmanaee, Nazanin Medghalchi, Zahra Atrkar Roshan, Manoosh Mehrabi, Setila Dalili

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	5 Aug 2022
Revised Date:	26 Sep 2022
Accepted Date:	21 Oct 2022

Revision (0)

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

Seyyedeh Azade Hoseini Nouri : Reviewer

30 Aug 2022

Dear Editor in chief,
I read the article and based on its novel topic, I recommend its publication.
With regards,
Seyyedeh Azade Hoseini Nouri

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 editor in chief,
We revised our article based on your valuable comments.
Reviewer 1:
Recommendations
1. add the study's design in the title or the abstract
We appreciate your comment. We revised it.
2. describe more about the double S method in the introduction
We appreciate your comment. We revised it.
3. medical students in the 3rd and 4th grades repeated several times unnecessarily (line 77)
We appreciate your comment. We revised it.
4. Present key elements of study design early in the paper
We appreciate your comment. We revised it.
5. Explain how the study size was arrived at
It was a pilot study based on our statistician consultation.
6. the article has some grammatical and punctual errors. it is recommended to revise by the native expertise in the English language.
We appreciate your comment. We revised it.
Reviewer 2:
Dear authors
Thank you for presenting this educational study. This was not experimental clinical research based on patients and diseases. This manuscript was educational and methods learning for students and professors, not clinical research. This was a valuable educational study but not compatible with topics of journal. Many medical universities (EDC or EDO department) have journal about education such as babol, shiraz, shahid beheshti, Nama in AJA university medical sciences and so on.
We appreciate your comment.
thank you
Reviewer 3:
Dear Editor in chief,
I read the article and based on its novel topic, I recommend its publication.
With regards,

We appreciate your comment.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 19 Oct 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.

REFEREE : EIC — 21 Oct 2022

This article is not suitable for publication because the authors have applied all comments correctly.