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.87290
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(1); e87290

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Tissue Transglutaminase and Anti-Endomysial Antibody Tests in Diagnosis of Celiac Disease"

Author(s): Mohammad Sobhani Shahmirzadi, Ahmad Sohrabi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Dec 2018
Revised Date: 4 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 23 Sep 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) — 29 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
The author should Please explain more the method section:
1. Type of study to be determined.
2. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are specified.
3. The statistical analytical method should be specified.
4. Please explain the diagnostic algorithm of celiac disease in your center.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
The author may explain more the method section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 3 Aug 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 minor revision.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 3 Aug 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 EIC of journal of comprehensive pediatrics

Thanks for your efforts and attention, this is the response to reviewers and all comments and corrections had done in article and highlighted there.

Reviewer 1:
the method section explained more with details.

Reviewer 2:
1- Type of study determined.
2. The inclusion and exclusion criteria were specified.
3. The statistical analytical method specified.
4. Diagnostic algorithm of celiac disease in our center described.

Thank you very much.

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) — 10 Aug 2019

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

Armen Malekian Taghi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 22 Sep 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) — 23 Sep 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 23 Sep 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.