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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/compreped.56008
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(3); e56008

Peer Review Report for "A Proactive Risk Assessment Through Healthcare Failure Mode and Effect Analysis in Pediatric Surgery Department"

Author(s): Yasamin Molavi-Taleghani, Hossein Ebrahimpour, Hojjat Sheikhbardsiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Jun 2017
Revised Date: 14 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Apr 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) — 3 Feb 2018

Dear AE,
- The article title and also somewhere in the manuscript contains some abbreviations which are somehow not routinely used so the reader may not be interested in the main document.
- The tables are a little more than expected and also they are so much detailed. Which is a little hard to understand the results. It would be appreciated if the authors try to merge or omit some of them.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 4 Apr 2018

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)** 4 Apr 2018

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.

Dear Chief Editor and the respected reviewers,

Thank you for your prompt attention and assessment of the manuscript titled “A proactive risk assessment by utilizing Healthcare Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (HFMEA) in pediatric surgery department” I revised the manuscript according to your constructive, useful and applicable comments. Changes are highlighted in the original text. I hope it satisfies the requirements of Journal of Comprehensive Pediatric readerships.

Reviewer 1:

The article title and also somewhere in the manuscript contains some abbreviations which ate somehow not routinely used so the reader may not be interested in the main document.

Response: Amended and Highlighted

The tables are a little more than expected and also they are so much detailed. Which is a little hard to understand the results. It would be appreciated if the authors try to merge or omit some of them.

Response: Amended and Highlighted

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.

Hamed Aghdam: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 10 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
This paper discusses Healthcare Failure Mode and Effect Analysis in assessing a proactive risk in the pediatric surgery department.
- The statistical analysis in this paper is suitable.
- In terms of experimental technique, this paper is conventional.
- The Methods section explained clearly.
- The results obtained will be useful in the related assessments.
- The tables are so much detailed, and it makes a little difficult to understand the complex, but it may be difficult to change it according to the experiment.
- Discussion of the findings of the papers in relation to recent findings and developments is clearly conducted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Apr 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Apr 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.