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.83761
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 10(3); e83761

Peer Review Report for "Electroencephalogram Abnormalities in Very Young Children with Acute Hepatitis A Infection: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Author(s): Iraj Shahramian, Mohammad Hassan Mohammadi, Alireza Akbari, Alireza Sargazi, Mojtaba Delaramnasab, Ali Bazi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Aug 2018
Revised Date: 8 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)

8 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled " Electroencephalogram Abnormalities in Children of Very Young Age with Acute Hepatitis A Infection; a Cross-Sectional Study", I read your manuscript carefully and I offer the following questions and suggestions:
1- What basic laboratory tests were done for the control group, and did you select the controls before or after doing these tests? (Line 52)
2- In the text of the manuscript is written in line 77 that the age difference was significant between the case and control group (P = 0.01), But in Table 1, this difference is not significant (P = 0.1). If this is a mistake by the typist, please correct it.
3- Range 5 to 40 are considered normal for transaminases, what is the reference for these numbers? In some references in children, normal ALT values are less than 19 and in some are less than 23.
4- Alb levels were reported high abnormal in 3 pts, how do you explain it?
5- Table 1 shows a significant difference between hemoglobin levels in the case and control groups. Did you find any cause for it?
6- I suggest that the title of table 1 be modified in the form below:" Table 1. Baseline and demographic characteristics of 45 children with hepatitis A infection and their controls."

Thank you.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 14 May 2019

Dear AE,
Because of the shortage of articles about hepatitis A and complications, this study is very valuable.
By consideration of hepatic encephalopathy is a tragic condition among pediatric diseases, the expertise willing have to prevent markers. In general, there are some markers about this issue such as Bilirubin total and direct rate, International Normalized Ratio(INR), PT as well Albumin and CBC of course in addition to clinical presentation.
At the same time of dictation & grammatical correction between lines, it is necessary the Author or authors make a correlation between the above parameters and EEG data.
Whereas in this study liver enzymes are prominent. If EEG data appear before the alteration of liver metabolic dysfunction, is more acceptable.
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 17 May 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)** 17 May 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.

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:
Dear authors of the manuscript entitled " Electroencephalogram Abnormalities in Children of Very Young Age with Acute Hepatitis A Infection; a Cross-Sectional Study", I read your manuscript carefully and I offer the following questions and suggestions:

1- What basic laboratory tests were done for the control group, and did you select the controls before or after doing these tests?(Line 52)

Reply - The healthy children were tested for basic organ function tests (CBC, liver enzymes, Fasting blood sugar, and thyroid hormones). This notion was added in the manuscript.

2- In the text of the manuscript is written in line 77 that the age difference was significant between case and control group (P = 0.01), But in Table 1, this difference is not significant (P = 0.1). If this is a mistake by typist, please correct.

Reply - The correct P value is 0.1. So, no significant difference indicated. The P value in the text was corrected.

3- Range 5 to 40 are considered normal for transaminases, what is the reference for these numbers? In some references in children, normal ALT values are less than 19 and in some are less than 23.

Reply – This was based on the Nelson’s textbook of pediatrics (20th edn. 2017)(1).

4- Alb levels were reported high abnormal in 3 pts, how do you explain it?

Reply- As the number of patients with abnormally high albumin level was not significant, and it was not possible to specify a statistical significant implication, we assume that this was caused by acute infection as a main cause of hyperalbuminemia.

5- Table 1 shows a significant difference between hemoglobin level in case and control groups. Did you find any cause for it?

Reply- We think that this is probably because of the effects of infection on erythropoiesis (i.e. infection associated anemia). Actually, this is a common phenomenon.

6- I suggest that the title of table 1 be modified in the form below:" Table 1. Baseline and demographic characteristics of 45 children with hepatitis A infection and their controls."

- Modified as recommended.
Thank you.

Reviewer 2:
Because shortage of articles about hepatitis A and complications , this study is very valuable. By consideration of hepatic encephalopathy is a tragic of condition among pediatric diseases , the expertise willing have preventing markers . In general , there are some markers about these issue such as Bilirubin total and direct rate, International Normalized Ratio(INR) , PT as well Albumin and CBC of course in addition of clinical presentation .
In the same time of dictation & grammatically correction between lines , it is necessary the Author or authors make a correlation between above parameters and EEG data .Whereas in this study liver enzymes are prominent . If EEG data appear before alteration of liver metabolic dysfunction, is more acceptable .

Reply:

The text was read carefully to correct grammatical errors. We highlighted these as green for better characterization. However, as you can see (table 2), the results of univariate analysis (association of abnormal EEG in HAV positive children), no significant association was found. Because of the nature of EEG (i.e. a categorical variable: normal/abnormal), we performed chi-square for seeking association which did not delivered significant result. So, we did not follow with further correlation.

Best regards

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Minor revision.

Reply: Done.

EIC Decision:

The manuscript needs minor revision.

Reply: Done.

1. Roberts I. Nelson’s textbook of pediatrics (20th edn.), by R. Kliegman, B. Stanton, J. St. Geme, N. Schor (eds). Springer; 2017.

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) — 14 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
I read the comments and I think that this manuscript can be accepted.
Thanks.

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.