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.62531
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(1) ; e62531

Peer Review Report for "Infants Teething Problems and Mothers' Beliefs in South East of Iran"

Author(s): Ghasem Miri-Aliabad, ali khajeh, Alireza Teimouri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	8 Oct 2017
Revised Date:	26 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	7 Feb 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

29 May 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Your effort is appreciable, but it seems the following recommendations would be helpful to improve your paper:
-“beliefs” is not match with the MeSH browser list.
- Please explain the time of study in the method section.
- Please explain about normal changes which are associated with teething in the introduction part. Based on pediatric dentistry texts some normal changes such as daytime restlessness, an increase in the amount of finger sucking or rubbing of the gum, an increase in drooling, and possibly some loss of appetite may happen

normally in this period.
- Kindly mention your inclusion and exclusion criteria for choosing mothers.
- Kindly provide limitations and suggestions.
- Discuss the inconsistent and consistent results between your findings and other articles, not only report the differences between your and another study's results.
- Please add some recent references for the last 5 years.
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor 7 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE : EIC 7 Jun 2019

Dear Author,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
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 Dr. Mohammad Reza Boloursaz

Editor-in-Chief

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript (62531). In what follows, A list of changes after considering the editors' and reviewer's comments are prepared:

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1:
Your effort is appreciable, but it seems these following recommends would be helpful to improve your paper:

1. -"beliefs" is not match with MeSH browser list.

   Answer: done.
   Keywords: Teething, Infants, Mothers, Symptoms

2. Please explain about normal changes which is associated with teething in introduction part. Based on pediatric dentistry texts some normal changes such as daytime restlessness, an increase in the amount of finger sucking or rubbing of the gum, an increase in drooling, and possibly some loss of appetite may happen normally in this period.
   Answer: done.
   Macknin ML reported an association between increased biting, drooling, gum rubbing, sucking, irritability, waking up, rubbing the ear, acne, loss of appetite for solid foods and body temperature with tooth eruption [8].

3. - Kindly mention your inclusion and exclusion criteria for choosing mothers.

   Answer: done.

   . Individual illegible to be included in the study were mothers with infants, from 6 to 30 months of age, who had at least one deciduous tooth.

4. Kindly provide limitation and suggestions.
   Answer:

The study limitation was lack of proper mothers with inclusion criteria to participate in the study that made long time for reaching suitable sample size.

5. Discuss about the inconsistent and consistent results between your findings and other articles, not only report the differences between your and another studies results.
   Answer: In a study by Sarrell et al., it was found that 76% of the parents and 83% of the nurses believed that teething is associated with infant morbidity. The most common symptoms included of irritability, fever, diarrhea and loose stools, ear infection, vomiting, wheezing, and exacerbated asthma [5]. From the present study the most common symptoms were gum rubbery, biting, irritability and fever with the percentages of 91%, 86%, 84% and 75% respectively.

6. Please explain about time of study in the method section.
   Answer: The study performed between February 2017 and February 2018.
7. - Please add some recent references of last 5 years.
   Answer: done, Ref 1,7, 14

All comments were put under consideration as much as possible. All changes are highlighted in red in the revised copy.

Yours sincerely
Ghasem Miri-Aliabad
Corresponding author

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 7 Feb 2021

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

REFEREE : EIC — 7 Feb 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.