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 "**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:

Peer Review

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/compreped.99088
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(2) ; e99088

Peer Review Report for "Improvement in Blood Transfusion Safety: Using Root Cause Analysis"

Author(s): sheida vahidi, Seyed Hadi Mirhashemi, Behrouz Hashemi, Marzieh Noorbakhsh, yasamin molavi taleghani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	11 Dec 2019
Revised Date:	10 May 2020
Accepted Date:	7 Feb 2021

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 — 27 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
There are some suggestions for minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

Ehsan Aghaei Moghadam : Reviewer — 2 May 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:

1. The manuscript's title indicates the novelty of the study and can attract the readers' attention.
2. The manuscript's title a good indicator of manuscript content.
3. The Abstract provides the context and background of the study.
4. There are adequate and appropriate key words 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. Tables and illustrations are helpful for better and faster understanding of the results.
9. Although the topic was interesting to me but study is somehow outdated.
10. Conclusions are related to the aim of the study.
11. The references are adequate for Original Articles.
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

2 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE : EIC

2 May 2020

Dear Author,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
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.

Hi dear,

The authors is very grateful for the comment reform of referees.

1- Regarding the comment of the referee who mentioned the following:

Although the topic was interesting to me but study is somehow outdated.

It should be mentioned:

In this study, the emphasis was on introducing the root cause analysis tool. With this tool, you can understand the cause of an errors and prevent the recurrence of the same error in health care organizations by setting a strategy. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to introduce more tools and In order for this tool to be relevant to the audience, these tools were used to explain the causal events related to blood transfusion. Because errors related to blood and blood products are common in health care organization. The results of the study may seem old-fashioned, but the root cause analysis tool is a practical tool in risk management and recommended that this tool be used to analyze errors leading to patient injury in hospitals.

2- *Please note the Ethical issues that were considered.*

Ethical issues were mentioned in the methods section.

Best regards

Yasamin Molavi Taleghani

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 7 Feb 2021

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

REFEREE : EIC — 7 Feb 2021

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