**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.69256
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 10(3); e69256

# Peer Review Report for "A Comparative Study on Ascetic Fluid Biochemical Markers in Cirrhotic Children with and Without Spontaneous Bacterial Peritonitis: A Cross-Sectional Observation"

**Author(s):** Gholamreza Kalvandi, Mahmoud Haghighat, Naser Honar, Iraj Shahramian, Mojtaba Delaramnasab, Ali Bazi

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 9 Apr 2018
Revised Date: 23 Jun 2019
Accepted Date: 3 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) — 23 May 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript is valuable because of fewer data in children.
According to textbook data, diagnosis SBP is just >250 PMN or ascetic fluid positive culture.There is some conflicting condition In this study for reader. Were total case 150 only cirrhotic patients with ascetic ? I don't understand they are with clinical SBP feature or no . I wished there were two groups 1-with SBP clinical presentation and 2-without, therefore I made a better interpretation. Maybe I did the mistake.
As well there were no serum-ascetic fluid parameters ratio for example LDH. In the other articles such as reference of no 9 ratio between parameters seen.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 7 Jun 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** (0) 7 Jun 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 (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; Journal of Comprehensive Pediatric**

Thank you for handling our manuscript through the review process. We also thank the dear reviewers for their great comments and time dedicated to read our manuscript. Here are our responses to their queries.

**Reviewers' Comments:**

**Reviewer 1:**
This manuscript is valuable because fewer data in children. According to text book data , diagnosis SBP is just >250 PMN or ascetic fluid positive culture.There is some conflicting condition In this study for reader . Were total case 150 only cirrhotic patients with ascetic ? I don't understand they are with clinical SBP feature or no . I wished there were two groups 1-with SBP clinical presentation and 2-without , therefore I made better interpretation .May be i did mistake. As well there were no serum-ascetic fluid parameters ratio for example LDH. In the other articles such as reference of no 9 ratio between parameters seen.

**Reply:** The study included 150 cirrhotic children with ascites, which were divided into two groups; with SBP (41 cases) and without SBP (109 cases). We made some corrections in the title to resolve the ambiguity. Then we analyzed the diagnostic validities of the biochemical markers for detecting SBP in cirrhotic children presented with ascites. The diagnostic criteria for SBP was the same as you mentioned which also has been noted in the methods, we also considered supporting clinical picture for an established diagnosis. The diagnostic validity of LDH has been assessed (highlighted). The parameters (sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV) for LDH have been noted in the line above those mentioned for reference number 9 (highlighted).

**Associate Editor's Comments:**

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript needs major revision.

**Reply:** Done.

**EIC Decision:**

Major revision

**Reply:** Done.

Regards.

**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) 2 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 3 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) 3 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.