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.97291
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(4); e97291

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Low Bone Mass in Patients with Hemophilia and Its Related Ractors in Southern Iran"

Author(s): Mohammadreza Bordbar, Sara Olyaeinezhad, Forough Saki, Sezaneh Haghpanah

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 17 May 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Jun 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Yazdan Ghandi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs major revision in the english edition.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 May 2020

Dear AE,
1. The manuscript's title does not indicate the novelty of the study but still can attract the readers' attention.
2. The manuscript's title a good indicator of the manuscript content.
3. The Abstract provides the context and background of the study.
4. There are adequate and appropriate keywords selected from the headings.
5. The study design is appropriate for answering the research question.
6. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are well mentioned.
7. Please note the Ethical issues that were considered.
8. Please explain in detail the theory related to the relationship between Low bone mass and hemophilia. Is there any other evidence for the cause behind that?

9. Tables and illustrations are helpful for a better and faster understanding of the results.
10. Although the topic was interesting to me but the study is somehow outdated.
11. Conclusions are related to the aim of the study.
12. The references are adequate for Original Articles.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 May 2020

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) 2 May 2020

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on reviewers' comments.
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 Dr. Mohammad Reza Boloursaz,

Associate Editor of "Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics",

We appreciate your kind cooperation in reviewing the manuscript entitled " Prevalence of low bone mass in patients with hemophilia and its related factors in Southern Iran" in your valuable journal, with Manuscript ID: 97291.

The manuscript is revised according to the comments, as are highlighted in yellow. I would appreciate it if you consider the revised manuscript for publication in your valuable journal.

In credible reply to reviewers:

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript needs major revision in english edition.
Answer: The manuscript is reviewed and checked by a native English editor. I hope that it will be acceptable now.

Reviewer 2:
1. The manuscript's title does not indicate the novelty of the study but still can attract the readers' attention.
Answer: thanks a lot.

2. The manuscript's title a good indicator of manuscript content.
Answer: thanks a lot.

3. The Abstract provides the context and background of the study.
Answer: thanks a lot.

4. There are adequate and appropriate key words selected from the headings.
Answer: thanks a lot.

5. The study design is appropriate for answering the research question
Answer: thanks a lot.

6. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are well mentioned.
Answer: thanks a lot.

7. Please note the Ethical issues that were considered.
Answer: The Ethics Committee of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences and the Vice-chancellor of research approved this study with the code of 97-01-01-17020. Written informed consent was obtained from each patient. It was added to the text.

8. Please explain in detail the theory related to the relationship between Low bone mass and the hemophilia. Is there any other evidence for the cause behind that?
Answer: low physical activity, HCV infection, vitamin D deficiency, BMI, arthropathy and cigarette smoking were some possible risk factors in low bone mass of hemophilia patients. Our data proved that severity of factor VIII / IX deficiency was the most important risk factor associated with both femoral and spinal LBM. One animal study showed that non-bleeding mice with hemophilia had lower BMD and abnormal bone structure compared with normal mice (26, 28). Hence, it seems that hemophilia, independent of its other complications such as HCV infection or arthroplasty, is associated with low bone mass (26, 28). This hypothesis is supported by some other studies that showed some thrombin receptors on osteoblasts (26, 28, 29), in addition to the inhibitory effect of factor VIII on osteoclastogenesis.

9. Tables and illustrations are helpful for better and faster understanding of the results.
Answer: thanks a lot.

10. Although the topic was interesting to me but study is somehow outdated.
Answer: thanks a lot. We have tried to report our regional data about low bone mass in heamophilia patients.

11. Conclusions are related to the aim of the study.
Answer: thanks a lot.

12. The references are adequate for Original Articles.
Answer: thanks a lot.

Thank you for your consideration of my work.

Sincerely yours,

Forough Saki

Shiraz Endocrinology and Metabolism Research Center

Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

e-mail: Sakeif@sums.ac.ir

P.O. Box: 71345-1744,

Tel: +98-711-6473096,

Fax: +98-711-6473096

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.

Ehsan Aghaei-Moghadam: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 20 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
I really appreciate the commitment to the authors' great job, and as a reviewer I am glad to have a small share in this success!!
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.