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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/compreped.13302
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(2); e13302

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Mercury Level of Cord Blood in Term and Preterm Neonates"

Author(s): Nastaran Khosravi, Abulhassan Divband, Nasrin Fathabadi, Nasrin Khalesi, Manije Sahlani, Monireh Monfaredi, آرش بردبار

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 May 2017
Revised Date: 21 Jun 2019
Accepted Date: 12 Jan 2020

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) 15 Jun 2017

Dear AE,
This manuscript needs revision and correction.
1. Title doesn't indicate the study design; more important subjects were assessed in this study. The title must be corrected.
2. Correct and proper English writing, for example "et all" to "et al."
3. Explain how study sample size was arrived?
4. Where is setting (city) of study?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Jun 2017

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- What is the side effect of mercury in neonate?
- How evaluated the use of fish consumption in pregnant women?
- Dental filling was done during pregnancy or before one?
- How much dental filling was done?

- What was the number of fish consumption in week or month,or tooth filling with amalgam
- Tabl 1 had very weak information and didnot have any valuable data
- The consumption of milk and fruit is important for inclusion creteria.
- The sample size is very low.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Jun 2017

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) 27 Jun 2017

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.

Thanks for your valuable comments:

What is the side effect of mercury in neonate?

Thanks for your valuable comments, Exposure to toxic mercury in Children may lead to the impairment of the developing central nervous system and pulmonary as well as nephrotic damage, this is added in the text, as highlighted. (page2, line 27)

How evaluated the use of fish consumption in pregnant women?

The consumption of fish in pregnant women was assessed using a checklist. (Page 3, line 7)

Dental filling was done during pregnancy or before one? How many dental filling was done?

Those Pregnant women were examined that filled at least two teeth before pregnancy. Those who filled their teeth during pregnancy or maximally filled one tooth were excluded. (Page 3, line1)

What was the number of fish consumption in week or month?

We examined pregnancy women who ate fish at least once a week. Women who ate less than this amount of fish were excluded.as highlighted in the text. (Page 3, line 10)

The consumption of milk and fruit is important for inclusion criteria.

All women were similar in terms of the consumption of milk and fruits and vegetables. Because of this, this items are not considered as inclusion criteria.

The sample size is very low

> The sample size was calculated according to the findings of previous studies with considering the significant level at 0.05 and the standard deviation as 1.9, as highlighted in the text. (Page 3, line 4)

1. Title doesn't indicate the study design; more important subjects were assessed in this study. The title must be corrected.
   Thanks for your valuable comment, it was corrected as

Comparison of mercury level of cord blood in term and preterm neonates: An analytical cross-sectional study

2. Correct and proper English writing, for example "et all" to *"et al."*
   It was corrected
3. Explain how study sample size was arrived?
   The sample size was calculated according to the findings of previous studies with considering the significant level at 0.05 and the standard deviation as 1.9, as highlighted in the text. (Page 3, line 4)
4. Where is setting (city) of study?
   Thanks for your valuable comments; we mentioned in the paper that the setting of the study was the Akbarabadi Hospital in Tehran, Iran, 2014. (Page 2, line 30)
   As highlighted in the text.

:Thanks for your comments

.The authors should state the following at the end of the manuscript

1. **Conflict of Interests:**
2. **Ethical Approval:**
3. **Informed Consent:**

The conflict of interest was added. (Page 6)

The ethical approval and informed consent was added (page 6)

- The Table(s) is (are) not mentioned in the text correctly. Please, mention the Table(s) in the text.

The Tables mentioned in the text as highlighted. (Page 3, line 23)

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) 27 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
1- An important factor for lead level is location of life but I think Tehran IS very big and definitly the author had to divided at least 2 area {noth and south}
2- The references is very oid
3- The history of drug consumption in mother wasn't evaluated
4- The article didn't have any inclusion and exclution criteria.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Apr 2019

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) 23 Apr 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Reviewer 1:
A important factor for lead level is location of life but I think Tehran IS very big and definitely the author had to divided at least 2 area {north and south}

Authors appreciate your valuable comments, The Akbarabadi Hospital is one of the biggest referral hospitals in Tehran, and from various parts of Tehran and various provinces, and there are referrals to this hospital. Thank you

2- The references is very old

Thank you for your valuable comment, we tried to use new replaced a number of references with new publications as highlighted in the manuscript, references part.

3- The history of drug consumption in mother wasn't evaluated

This issue was one of the exclusion criteria in our study, and mothers who consumed a special drug that had an effect on the response, as well as mothers who had a specific illness, excluded from the study. Thank you

4-the article didn't have any inclusion and exclusion criteria

Thank you, according to your valuable comment, the inclusion and exclusion criteria are added in text as highlighted in Page2 and 3.

Thank you for your valuable comments that help us to improve our study.

Best regards

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 12 Jan 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 12 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.