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

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.113481
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 10(3); e113481

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Celiac Disease Prevalence Among Patients with Refractory Hypothyroidism: A Cross-sectional Study"

Author(s): Pezhman Alavinejad, Hajieh Bibi Shahbazian, Alireza Jahanshahi, Mohamad Faramarzi, Zahra Shokati Eshkiki

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	4 Feb 2021
Revised Date:	14 Apr 2021
Accepted Date:	16 May 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 | **Revision** (0)

10 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for sending this manuscript with the title: Evaluation of celiac disease prevalence among patients suffering from refractory hypothyroidism. this subject is important in chronic disease headlines. The manuscript needs some revision by the authors before acceptance.
The title: You can write the type of the study end of your title for example....: an analytical study.
- Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction. you should explain the necessity of your study.
- Design of the study has not explained clearly. what is the pilot study? I think your study is not a pilot study.
- What was your sampling strategy; it is a critical point for external validity in your study. What are your inclusion and exclusion criteria?
- The reliability and validity of the measurement tools were unknown.
- What strategy did you use for verification bias?
- You should be explaining the analysis and how to analysis your data.
- Did you check normal assumptions? Parametric or non-parametric statistical tests.
- There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

- Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study.
- please bring your ethical code
- Please write your author contribution.
- Please explain acknowledgment of your study.

Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 10 Apr 2021

Dear AE,

This manuscript needs essential correction by the authors. I think it should be corrected basically.

• Please check your Keywords with the MeSh database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions
• You should show the problem of your study in the introduction.
• Design of the study has not explained clearly.
• What was your sample size formula?
• why did you get such a small sample? you said all Khuzestan but it was small
• The reliability and validity of the measurement tools were unknown.
• What strategy did you use for verification bias?
• You should be explaining the analysis and use of statistical formulas.
• There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.
• Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study.

Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion.

Thank you.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,

Thanks for submitting the manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments the article needs some revisions in all parts. I recommend the authors revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.

With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Apr 2021

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts. I recommend you revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.

With regards.

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 Sir

Many thanks for valuable comments. Please find the explanation as following:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Editor,
Thank you for sending this manuscript with the title: Evaluation of celiac disease prevalence among patients suffering from refractory hypothyroidism. this subject is important in chronic disease headlines. your manuscript needs some revision before acceptance.
The title: You can write the type of the study end of your title for example....: an analytical study.

Response: type of study added to the title.
- Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction. you should explain the necessity of your study.

Response: some more explanation added to introduction.
- Design of the study has not explained clearly. what is the pilot study? I think your study is not a pilot study.

Response: type of study corrected as cross sectional.
- What was your sampling strategy; it is a critical point for external validity in your study. What are your inclusion and exclusion criteria?

Response: during a 6 months period, all of the cases with refractory hypothyroidism included. Refractory hypothyroidism defined as daily need to levothyroxine more than 250 µgr/day for controlling of hypothyroidism. (Mentioned in method)
- The reliability and validity of the measurement tools were unknown.

Response: all of the serologic tests measured in a standard referral laboratory.
- What strategy did you use for verification bias?
- You should be explaining the analysis and how to analysis your data.
- Did you check normal assumptions? Parametric or non-parametric statistical tests.

Response: added to the method section.
- There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

Response: the text checked and revised for spelling and grammar errors.
- Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study.

Response: the limitations and strong points added at the end of discussion section.

- please bring your ethical code

Response: the ethical code is mention in method section (highlighted).

-Please write your author contribution.

Response: author contribution added to the cover letter.

-Please explain acknowledgment of your study.

Response: none to declare.

Thanks

Reviewer 2:

Dear Author,

This manuscript needs essential correction. I think it should correct basically.

• Please check your Keywords with the MeSh database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions

Response: key words revised.

• You should show the problem of your study in the introduction.

Response: added to the introduction.

• Design of the study has not explained clearly.

Response: design as cross sectional study explained and added.

• What was your sample size formula?

Response: cases collected based on time period.

• why did you get such a small sample? you said all Khuzestan but it was small

Response: during 6 months period all of the cases with refractory hypothyroidisms referred from endocrinology clinics.

• The reliability and validity of the measurement tools were unknown.

• What strategy did you use for verification bias?

• You should be explaining the analysis and use of statistical formulas.

Response: the statistical method explained.

• There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

Response: Response: the text checked and revised for spelling and grammar errors.

• Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study.

Response: mentioned.

Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion.

Response: mentioned.

Thank you.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts. I recommend you revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.
With regards.

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) — 9 May 2021

Dear AE,
This manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thank you very much.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 15 May 2021

Dear EIC,
All comments were made.
Thank you very much

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 16 May 2021

Dear Author,
your manuscript in the current format is acceptable for publication.
With the regards.