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.97114
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(1); e97114

Peer Review Report for "Association of Celiac Disease with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder"

Author(s): Naser Honar, Maryam Barkhordarian, Ahmad Ghanizadeh, Roya Radanfar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 22 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 11 Nov 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) — 7 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
There are some points that should be addressed by the author.
1. Please describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
2. This study requires a control group, which matched in age and gender with the case group.
3. The references should be modified based on the journal's format. (for example: No:6, 10, 18, 19)
4. The results of the study should be consistent with the title.
5. What are the limitations of the study?
6. Was the test (anti tTG antibody-IgA) checked at one time? Was it done in one lab? Are there any false positives results?
7. Do you have any justification, why all the seropositive patients were male?
Thanks.

Mohammad Sobhani Shahmirzadi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 23 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The subject and plan is novel and acceptable. some point and faults present in article and

must be corrected. comments highlighted in text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 24 Sep 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major 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) 24 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

Reviewer's questions and answers:

Reviewer 1:

1. Q: revise the sentence: there was no IgA deficiency in our patients

A: Changed to "There was no IgA deficiency in our patients"

2. Q: which tests?

A: There was no association between Attention deficit Hyperactivity disorder severity serum anti TTG antibody positivity.

3. Q: questionaires are based on DSM 4. Highlighted

A: According to DSM-IV

4. Q:the exact report is only silent cases of celiac in shiraz, please read the original article and correct the sentence.

A: In main article the symptoms of celiac disease is not asked from the cases so as it is mentioned that they are healthy, may be some had occasional symptoms that had not been asked in the study

5. Q: research type? retrospective? cross sectional? prospective? it is not defined

A: Cross-sectional

6. Q: s really need to this table?

normal range for IgA could be omitted because of not necessary information.

but the table of TTG results of the 6 patients is better for this article and seems necessary.

A: The table is omitted and the positive anti TTG results in result.

7. Q: is 6 case enough for statistic conclusion? are case numbers in two groups (93 and 6) rational for conclusion?

A: The main goal of study was to find prevalence of celiac disease among ADHD patients. It was the test result that out of 99 cases only 6 cases were positive for anti TTG anibody.

Maybe we could make the test result more rational but as I mentioned in discussion,the cases were not cooperative and we could only run the test for 99 cases.(we originally had 167 cases that did not consent to stay in the study)

8.Q: ?? the sentence is not clear with no point.

A: There is no difference in celiac symptoms between cases with positive and negative anti TTG antibody test in Table II.

9.Q: is 6 case enough for statistic conclusion? are case numbers in two groups (93 and 6) rational for conclusion?

A: Absolutely not, primarily we did the study to find out how much is the prevalence of celiac in ADHD and then we did the comparison between the two groups.

10. Q: which groups? sentence is obscure and not clear.

A: Both positive and negative anti TTG antibody group

11. Q: this is a rule for gastroenterologists and they do this based on their knowledge and case finding. recommending for celiac disease based on related symptoms is not related and not under responsibility of this article . the authors of this article can recommend that celiac screening is acceptable in ADHD patients because of 3 times prevalence than general population. but besides of high prevalence of celiac seropositivity the authors didn't recommend and didn't explain for their conclusion.

A: Celiac screening test is acceptable for ADHD patient as the prevalence of anti TTG antibody is higher than general population.

Reviewer 2:

1.Q: Please describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

A: Inclusion criteria is all patients diagnosed with ADHD.

Exclusion criteria is patients with autoimmune and neurologic disease. (highlighted in text)

2. Q:This study requires a control group, which matched in age and gender with the case group.

A: It's a cross sectional study

3. Q:The references should be modified based on the journal's format. (for example: No:6, 10, 18, 19)

A: Done exactly the same as journal rules

4.Q: The results of the study should be consistent with the title.

A: I can change the title to " Prevalence of celiac disease in ADHD patients" if you preferred.

5.Q: What are the limitations of the study?

A: The noncooperation of patients due to lack of appropriate educational status made the sample small

6. Q: Was the test (anti tTG antibody-IgA) checked at one time? Was it done in one lab? Are there any false positives results?

A: All samples were taken during 2016-2018 but all tests were done in one day in one lab. The false positive is 0.07 .

7. Q:Do you have any justification, why all the seropositive patients were male?

A: Among all 93 patients there were only 6 positives, I couldn’t do anything with the result gender.

The changes for reviewer 1 is highlighted in yellow in text.
The changes for reviewer 2 is highlighted in Green in the text.

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) 28 Oct 2019

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

Mohammad Sobhani Shahmirzadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 10 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Revision and corrections based on my critic is accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 Nov 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 11 Nov 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.