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.97482
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(2); e97482

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Serum Bilirubin Level of Neonates Under Phototherapy with Two Methods of Transcutaneous and Total Serum Bilirubin Measurement"

Author(s): Alireza Sadeghnia, Nasrin Hashemian Nejad, Shadi Noorizadeh , Ehsan Shahrestanaki, Zahra Jamshidi , Hassan Salehipoor, Mohammad Sahebkar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 9 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 23 Feb 2020

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) — 16 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

Fahimeh Ehsanipour: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
I suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 2 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The references are very old. Please replace it with new searches.
Please revise based on the reviewer's comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 2 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Manuscript title: Comparison of serum bilirubin level of neonates under phototherapy with two methods of transcutaneous and total serum bilirubin measurements.

Dear editor

We appreciate the constructive criticism and comments of the reviewers, and opportunity to respond. We are delighted to hear that the reviewers found merit and interest in our study, and we have revised the manuscript in accordance with the comments of the reviewers. We have indicated the changes throughout the revised manuscript with highlight in file entitled “Bilirubin highlighted”.

Reviewer #1: Comments

Q: objective
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 1, line 5.

Q: total serum bilirubin measurement not serology ….
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 1, line 6. Also we corrected all through manuscript.

Q: Its seems to be descriptive study or descriptive-analytical study, not prospective
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 1, line 7.

Q: 24 hours not 48
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 1, line 8.

Q: only TcB in background represented; only TcB
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 1, line 9. Also we corrected all through manuscript

Q: which times???
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 1, line 10.

Q: Eligible
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 1, line 13.

Q: Be written according to mesh
R: we corrected based on Mesh term accordingly, see page 1, lines 23-4.

Q: this part is too brief
R: we added some parte to the background section accordingly, see page 2, lines 30-3, 43-8, 49, and 52

Q: literature review?????
R: we could not get the reviewer’s comment exactly, by the way, we rewrote this section again for better understanding accordingly, see page 2, lines 49-53.

Q: descriptive-analytical study
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 59.

Q: TSB and TcB
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 60.

Q: eligible neonates not all neonates
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 62.

Q: please explain about sampling methods…
R: we added accordingly, see page 3, line 63-4.

Q: mg/dl
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 64.

Q: 2200 gram
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 65.

Q: What 120 hours? Intervention implemented in 4 day or 96 hours
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 66.

Q: sample size written above, before methods
R: we exchanged the part accordingly, see page 3, lines 71-3.

Q: It is not understandable, 4 days or 2 days??
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 75.

Q: TcB
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 3, line 78.

Q: was bilicheck calibrated? With who??
R: we added accordingly, see page 3, lines 79-82.

Q: About TcB please explain how bilicheck used?
R: we explained accordingly, see page 3, lines 80-1.

Q: Please explain about phototherapy device.
Made by company……. The number of lamps……. and time of use ……
R: we added accordingly, see page 4, lines 83-6.

Q: levels
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 4, line 91.

Q: were
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 4, line 92.

Q: don’t need parenthesis written TSB and TcB
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 4, line 99.

Q: space with previous paragraph
R: we spaced accordingly, see page 4, line 102.

Q: be expressed in sample size part not this part
R: we corrected and added some sentences accordingly, see page 4, line 103-5.

Q: in table be expressed other demographic variables. Both in table and results expressed only two variables??
R: we added some demographic variables in the text and table accordingly, see page 4, line 103-5 and Table 1

Q: ??
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 4, line 111.

Q: The titles of tables be written above of tables
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 5, line 117.

Q: tests
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 5, line 124.

Q: were; ?; singular or plural?
R: regarding these three comments, because the subject here is correlation so its singular, accordingly, see page 5, lines 124-6.

Q: The titles of tables be written above of tables
R: we corrected accordingly, see page 6, line 130.

Q: Written full words in footer
R: we explained in detail accordingly, see page 6, lines 132-4.

Q: for all Year? et al comment in the discussion section
R: we added et al. and year as well as updated the references as far as we could accordingly, see page 7, line 147, 151, 156-7, 160, 162-3, and 165-6.

Q: don’t need reference
R: we omitted accordingly, see page 7, line 175.

Q: some of references are out of date
R: we updated the references as far as we could and some of the are necessary for comparing as they are similar to our study accordingly, see page 8, lines 203-249

Authors’ response: We made extensive changes in introduction and discussion sections by updating old version and adding new references. Also, we went through the reviewer comments and made them correction step by step as you can see on the track change file. Moreover, we made some changes in our tables which are more clarify our findings. Finally, we went through the whole manuscript and made a correction on some grammatical errors.

In summary, we appreciate the editor and the reviewers for their constructive comments, which we believe have helped to substantially improve the manuscript. We have revised the manuscript in accordance with comments of the editor and reviewers and are hopeful that the revised manuscript will now be acceptable for publication. We are, however, willing to make additional revisions if needed.

Sincerely,

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) 23 Feb 2020

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 Feb 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 Feb 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.