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.97867
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(4); e97867

Peer Review Report for "Epidemiological and Clinical Features of Acute Poisoning in Children in a Referral Teaching Hospital in Iran, 2015 - 2018"

Author(s): Navid Mohammadi, Nafiseh Rastgoo, Sohrab Esmaeil Zadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 6 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 20 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.

Kalenahalli Jagadishkumar: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 23 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Noting new in the study
- Only data
- Not many refrence from poisoning in IRAN
- POOR TABLES
- CLASSIFICATIONS OF POISONS CLARITY NOT THERE
- NEED GOOD DISCUSSION

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 11 Mar 2020

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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Mar 2020

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.

Dear editor in chief,

I would like to thank you and respectful reviewer for considering our manuscript entitled "**Epidemiological and Clinical Features of Acute Poisoning in Children in a Referral Teaching Hospital in Iran, 2015-2018",** ID: 97867, and giving us the great points to improve our work.

Here are comments from the reviewer and our corrections:

Reviewer 1:
Noting new in the study, only data

This is an epidemiologic study on the characteristics of pediatric poisoning in our area so it is pretty normal that provides a considerable amount of information. Of course, all the provided information is completely related and meaningful according to our understanding. At the same time, some sophisticated analyses such as logistic regression has performed and provided.

not many references from poisoning in IRAN

we have added some Iranian reference to the previous ones. We acknowledge that there are not too many recent reports from Iran and actually this is a strength point for our research that provides relatively newer information.

POOR TABLES

Some changes have been made to tables 1 and 3 and a new table as well as a figure has been added (table 4. Figure 1).

CLASSIFICATIONS OF POISONS CLARITY NOT THERE

There are different classifications for poisoning agents in the literature based on our search and we chose an appropriate classification according to compatibility with the in-hospital registry system (HIS).

NEED GOOD DISCUSSION

Discussion is updated with some complementary statements.

Herby, I re-submit the corrected manuscript with highlighted changed parts in the text and hopefully it is satisfying for the reviewers and publishing in the journal.

Best regards,

Nafiseh Rastgoo

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) 25 May 2020

Dear AE,
This article needs revision in:
- tables modifications
- sentencess modifications
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 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** (1) 26 May 2020

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 (2)

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 editor in chief,

I would like to thank you and respectful reviewer for considering our manuscript entitled "**Epidemiological and Clinical Features of Acute Poisoning in Children in a Referral Teaching Hospital in Iran, 2015-2018",** ID: 97867, and giving us the great points to improve the work.

Here are comments from the reviewer and our corrections:

Reviewer 1:
needs revision

tables modifications

Thank the reviewer, we corrected tables 1 and 2. They are corrected now.
sentences modifications

We have reviewed whole text and updated the sentences in different parts of the manuscript.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript still needs revision.

Revision has been done and highlighted in the text.

EIC Decision:

Please revise the manuscript accurately.

Done!

Herby, I re-submit the corrected manuscript with highlighted changed parts in the text and hopefully it is satisfying for the reviewers and publishing in the journal.

Best regards,

Nafiseh Rastgoo

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 2 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
This article still can be improved in tables information.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 2 Jun 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** (2) 2 Jun 2020

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 (3)

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 editor in chief,

I would like to thank you and respectful reviewer for considering our manuscript entitled "**Epidemiological and Clinical Features of Acute Poisoning in Children in a Referral Teaching Hospital in Iran, 2015-2018",** ID: 97867, and giving us the great points to improve the work.

Here are comments from the reviewer and our corrections:

Reviewer 1:
still can improve tables information

We transferred the data from the previous table 1 to the text and merged the data in tables 2 and 3 to have the present table 1. We also removed table 4. There is only one table left now.

Putting the data of poisoning agents and the most frequent clinical manifestations together (in the present table 1) does make sense to have a better understanding of the relationship between the manifestations and the agents for the readers.

After all, if there is still any concern about the table (s), we would be more than thankful if the respectful reviewer mentions what changes on which table should be performed.

Associate Editor 1:
Please revise accurately.

Revision has been done and changes are highlighted in the text.

EIC Decision:

Minor revision still needed.

Done!

Herby, I re-submit the corrected manuscript with highlighted changed parts in the text and hopefully it is satisfying for the reviewers and publishing in the journal.

Best regards,

Nafiseh Rastgoo

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 20 Jun 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** (3) 20 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 20 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.