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.68342
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 10(3); e68342

Peer Review Report for "Association Between Smoking, Alcohol Consumption, and Dietary Habits in Northern Thai Adolescents in Thailand, 2016 - 2017"

Author(s): Nonglak Boonchooduang, Narueporn Likhitweerawong, Orawan Louthrenoo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Mar 2018
Revised Date: 22 Jun 2019
Accepted Date: 1 Jul 2019

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)

4 May 2019

Dear AE,
I received the paper entitled "The Association Between Smoking, Alcohol Consumption, and Dietary Habits in Adolescents". It is an epidemiological study conducted in a city in Thailand. It has valuable results, so overall it could be acceptable, after minor revisions.
- It is highly recommended to add the place and time of the study in title of the cross-sectional studies
- Replace the keywords with those compatible with MeSH system (For example, "dietary behaviors" should replace with "Feeding Behavior")
- I suggest the authors summarize the introduction part in just 3 paragraphs including background, problem statement, and study logic.
- In the methods part, say more details regarding the data gathering process (For example, who and how described the study's importance for the participants and etc.)
- Add limitations of your study at the end of discussion part
Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

7 Jun 2019

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) 7 Jun 2019

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.

Response to Reviewer:

1. It is highly recommended to add the place and time of the study in title of the cross-sectional studies
The place and time of the study are now added to the title, as highlighted.

2. Replace the keywords with those compatible with MeSH system (For example, "dietary behaviors" should replace with "Feeding Behavior")
All the keywords are now replaced with the MeSH terms, as highlighted.

3. I suggest you to summarize the introduction part in just 3 paragraphs including background, problem statement and study logic.
The introduction part is summarized into 3 paragraphs, as suggested.

4. In methods part, say more details regarding data gathering process (For example, who and how described the study importance for the participants and etc.)
More details are added, as suggested.

5. Add limitations of your study at the end of discussion part
Limitations, which were in the second half of the last paragraph of discussion, are now separated as another paragraph, at the end of discussion part.

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) — 1 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
It seems that the paper has been revised properly, so I can recommend it for publication.
Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 1 Jul 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 1 Jul 2019

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