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.94278
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(2); e94278

Peer Review Report for "Serum Magnesium Levels in Neonatal Jaundice: Is There any Correlation Between Hypermagnesemia and Moderate to Severe Hyperbilirubinemia in Term Newborns?"

Author(s): Fahimeh Ehsanipour, Elahe Norouzi, Nastaran Khosravi, Hosna Mirfakhraee

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 May 2019
Revised Date: 30 Nov 2019
Accepted Date: 8 Dec 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 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Method: it would better define level of moderte hyperbilirubinemia exactly. for example according to your study it might be 16-20
- Result: There is no term of " Icteric neonate" in litrature, it should be changed to "Jaundiced neonate"
- Discussion: Paragraph No. 5 is not clear and it would better revise
- Kindly pay attention to some dictation and punctuation mistakes
Thanks.

Parisa Mohagheghi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Though this article could not show any relationship between serum bilirubin and Mg level, as there are opposing results in this regard it could be used as an article for the negative correlation.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Nov 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.

Reply to reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1:
Though this article could not show any relationship between serum bilirubin and Mg level, but as there are opposing results in this regard it could be used as an article for negative correlation.

Reply to reviewer 1: Of course! Ipso facto, the title is written in question form, and in discussion, no correlation highlighted.

Reviewer 2:
- Method: it would better define level of moderte hyperbilirubinemia exactly. for example according to your study it might be 16-20
Reply: Moderate hyperbilirubinemia definition according to bilirubin level described again.

- Result: There is no term of " Icteric neonate" in litrature, it should be change to "Jaundiced neonate"
Reply: term of "icteric neonate" changed to "jaundiced neonate".

- Discussion: Paragraph No. 5 is not clear and it would better revise
Reply: discussion revised as your comment.

- Kindly pay attention to some dictation and punctuation mistakes
Reply: Some English writing mistakes corrected.

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) 4 Dec 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) 8 Dec 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 8 Dec 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.