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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.114541
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 11(1); e114541

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome and Related Factors in Patients with Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver"

Author(s): Mehrnoosh Zakerkish, Abolghasem Assarzadeh, Seyed Saeed Seyedian, Alireza Jahanshahi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Aug 2021
Revised Date: 9 Nov 2021
Accepted Date: 10 Nov 2021

Revision (0)

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

Mehrnaz Ahmadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
This manuscript is valuable, but the writing and reporting are not well done. The authors should consider the following points to improve the manuscript:
1. The title is long, there is no need to mention the place of sampling in the title.
2. Two different abstracts are presented. Please correct it!!!
In the abstract
3. The method is not written at all correctly. The type of study, sample size, and sampling location are not known.
4. The findings are not well written. Key findings have not been reported.
5. I did not understand the meaning of this sentence: "People in grades 1 and 2 of fatty liver have more metabolic syndrome. On the other hand, all people in grade 3 had metabolic syndrome". ???!!!
6. There is no connection between the conclusion and the findings!!! The conclusion should

be consistent with the findings!!!!!!!!!
Write 3 to 5 keywords derived from the mesh.
Introduction:
7. The present manuscript further explains fatty liver and metabolic syndrome and their related factors. The introduction does not review related texts.
8. The importance of the issue has not been clearly discussed.
Method:
8. The study reference cited to determine the sample size is not mentioned.
9. The sampling method is not known.
10. Describe how to access eligible samples.
Results:
11. Table 2 shows a statistically significant difference between age groups based on fatty liver rating. But in the findings, this issue is not written correctly. Line 119 should be corrected.
12. You tested the presence or absence of significant differences between different groups, so change the word "relationship" in the text and tables to "differences". The correlation test should be used to measure the relationship or correlation. It is suggested a correlation between the grade of fatty liver with BMI, gender, and age should also be examined.
13. You mentioned in the statistical tests section that you used non-parametric tests, while in the text of the findings you mentioned the t-test and ANOVA test ???????? !!!!!!!! Please explain this clearly.
14. Write the findings more concisely. Many findings can be integrated. For example, explain all the items that are significant on the basis of gender and non-significant items in a concise and titrated manner by mentioning the P-value in one paragraph.
Discussion:
15. Line 164: This sentence does not make sense: "The association between NAFLD and metabolic syndrome showed that patients in grades 1 and 2 of fatty liver have more metabolic syndrome. On the other hand, all patients with grade 3 had metabolic syndrome".
16. The discussion is very long. There is no need to repeat the findings in the discussion. Try to report only significant findings or important cases and compare them with similar studies and explain the difference or similarity of your study with the study of others by stating the reason.
17. Line 200: You did not cite this article: Fakhrizadeh et al study in 2003
18. Use newer references in the discussion section. References are very old.
19. Most of the studies used in the discussion are Iranian. Use foreign studies in the same proportion.
20. Line 274 mentions Numerous studies but only one reference is mentioned !!
21. The author's name is mentioned in the acknowledgment section and this is not common.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
In the manuscript title" Prevalence of metabolic syndrome in patients with fatty liver…."
There have been some comments as follow:

Title:
- It is better the title revise as follow" Prevalence of metabolic syndrome in patients with fatty liver"
- The title is very long and should be short
Abstract:
- Background and objectives:
- In this section the author mentioned "in one of the primary treatment centers in the Ahvaz" what means that? In the title the author mentioned two places for research the gastrointestinal and endocrinology clinics of Ahvaz Golestan and Imam Khomeini Hospitals
Materials and methods:
- This section was written ambiguous and should be revise
Conclusion:
- In this section the author mentions the result not conclusion
Keywords:
- Should be revised
Introduction:
- NAFLD should be describe in line 38 not line 40
- What means HHC?
- The author did not mention the objective of research in this section
- The importance of this research is vague
- The sentences are ambiguous and repetitious
Result:
- In line 119 author do not mention to fatty liver grade for women
conclusion:
- This section written very long and the author in the first of this section mentions resulting
- When the author comprises the result of this study with other study, only mention the result but not discuss about them, except in some places
Conclusion:
- In this section the author mention to result
Table:
- Tables 2 &3 are wrong
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting this manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs some revisions in all sections. The authors should revise their manuscript and resubmit.
With regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Sep 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs revision in all sections. you should read all comments and amendment your manuscript based on these comments then resubmit. it should be noted

that there is a word file attached to this comment that you should pay attention to this file too.

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 Editor, Here is our Response to Reviewer's comments: The corrected parts are painted red in the article.

Reviewer 1: Q1: [It is better the title revise as follow" Prevalence of metabolic syndrome in patients with fatty liver?], R1: [edited], line number:1

Q2: [In this section the author mentioned "in one of the primary treatment centers in the Ahvaz" what means that? In the title the author mentioned two places for research the gastrointestinal and endocrinology clinics of Ahvaz Golestan and Imam Khomeini Hospitals], R2: edited], line number:7-8

Q3: [*This section was written ambiguous and should be revise*?], R3: [edited], line number:3-32

Q4: [*In this section the author mentions the result not conclusion*?], R4: [edited], line number:19-32

Q5: [key words *Should be revise*?], R5: [edited], line number:36-37

Q6: [*NAFLD should be describe in line 38 not line 40*?], R6: [edited], line number:43

Q7: [*What means HHC?*], R7: [edited], line number:55

Q8: *The author did not mention the objective of research in this section*], R8: [edited], line number:91-92

Q9: [*in line 119 author do not mention to fatty liver grade for women*], R9: [edited], line number:

q10: [*this section written very long and the author in the first of this section mention to result*], R10: [edited], line number:177-194

Q11: [*when the author comprises the result of this study with other study, only mention the result but not discuss about them, except in some places*], R11: [edited], line number:195-200

Reviewer 2: Q1: [*The title is long, there is no need to mention the place of sampling in the title.*?], R1: [edited], line number:1

Q2: [*Two different abstracts are presented. Please correct it!!! In the abstract*], R2: [edited], line number:4-32,

Q3: [*he method is not written at all correctly. The type of study, sample size, and sampling location are not known.e*?], R3: [edited], line number:4-32

Q4: [*The findings are not well written. Key findings have not been reported.*?], R4: [edited], line number:19-32

Q5: [*I did not understand the meaning of this sentence: "People in grades 1 and 2 of fatty liver have more metabolic syndrome. On the other hand, all people in grade 3 had metabolic syndrome". ???!!!*?], R5: [deleted

Q6: [*here is no connection between the conclusion and the findings!!! The conclusion should be consistent with the findings!!!!!!!!! Write 3 to 5 keywords derived from the mesh.*?], R6: [edited], line number:36-37

Q7: [*The present manuscript further explains fatty liver and metabolic syndrome and their related factors. The introduction does not review related texts.?*], R7: [edited], line number:43-51

Q8: *The importance of the issue has not been clearly discussed.*], R8: [edited], line number:91-92

Q9: [*The sampling method is not known.*], R9: [edited], line number:233-243,

q10: [*. Describe how to access eligible samples.*], R10: [edited], line number:100

Q11: [*Table 2 shows a statistically significant difference between age groups based on fatty liver rating. But in the findings, this issue is not written correctly. Line 119 should be corrected.*], R11: [edited], line number:137

Q12: [*You tested the presence or absence of significant differences between different groups, so change the word "relationship" in the text and tables to "differences". The correlation test should be used to measure the relationship or correlation. It is suggested a correlation between the grade of fatty liver with BMI, gender, and age should also be examined.*], R11: [edited], line number:134-175

Q13: [*ou mentioned in the statistical tests section that you used non-parametric tests, while in the text of the findings you mentioned the t-test and ANOVA test ???????? !!!!!!!! Please explain this clearly.*], R11: [edited], line number:121-124

Q14: [*Write the findings more concisely. Many findings can be integrated. For example, explain all the items that are significant on the basis of gender and non-significant items in a concise and titrated manner by mentioning the P-value in one paragraph.*], R11: [edited], line number:127-175

Q15: [*Line 164: This sentence does not make sense: "The association between NAFLD and metabolic syndrome showed that patients in grades 1 and 2 of fatty liver have more metabolic syndrome. On the other hand, all patients with grade 3 had metabolic syndrome".*], R11: [deleted],

Q16: [*The discussion is very long. There is no need to repeat the findings in the discussion. Try to report only significant findings or important cases and compare them with similar studies and explain the difference or similarity of your study with the study of others by stating the reason.*], R11: [edited], line number:177-194

Q17: [*Line 200: You did not cite this article: Fakhrizadeh et al study in 2003*], R11: [edited], line number:201

Q18: [*Use newer references in the discussion section. References are very old.*], R11: [edited], line number:270,273

Q19: [*Most of the studies used in the discussion are Iranian. Use foreign studies in the same proportion.*], R11: [edited], line number:233-243

Q20: [*Line 274 mentions Numerous studies but only one reference is mentioned !!*], R11: [edited], line number:236-241, 195-200

Q21: [*The author's name is mentioned in the acknowledgment section and this is not common.*], R11: [edited], line number:292-294

best 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.

neda sayadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 28 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
After reviewing this article, the author corrects some section but there is some section should be revised:
- The abstract is very long and should be short.
- Keywords should be revised. The author should not be use abbreviation
- The result section should be written short. it is very long and the author should be mention only important notes.
- The discussion section should be written short and should be correct. The author did not change this section.
Thanks.

Mehrnaz Ahmadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 1 Oct 2021

Dear AE<
Comments for the authors:
1. The title needs to be modified: Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome and Related Factors in Patients with Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver.
2. The abstract is very long. The volume of the abstract should be 250 words. It is not necessary to list all the results in the abstract. Only the main results should be reported in the abstract. The same goes for the method.
3. What does this sentence mean? "the results show that the mean age was not between the three grades of fatty liver ($p = 0.026$)".
4. In line 29, this sentence should be corrected. "There was no statistically significant relationship between BP, TG, HDL, FBS and waist circumference with different grades of fatty liver ($p<0.05$)" If there is no statistical difference, why is P reported significant?
5. In the conclusion section the author mentions the result, not a conclusion.
6. This sentence should be corrected in lines 136 and 137: "The results show that there is a correlation significant difference between age with three grades of the fatty liver". Must be written: The results show that there is a statistically significant difference between age groups based on fatty liver rating.
7. Modify table titles.
8. Correct the way sentences are written in the text, can the two words "difference" and "correlation" come together??????? Lines 134 to 175 need major grammatical corrections. For example, "The results of the study show that there is no statistically significant

difference between women and men in terms of the duration of diagnosis of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease."
9. Lines 121 to 124 are grammatically incorrect.
10. The article needs a literary and grammatical edition.
11. Lines 128 to 132 need to be modified. Where is this information reported?
12. Discussion needs to be reconsidered. The authors only mention the result but do not discuss them, except in some places. Lines 177 to 194 – 204-219 need to be modified.
13. Briefly report the results of your study, then compare them with similar studies. P values should not be mentioned in the discussion. P values are for the results section of the article. For example, No significant difference was observed in this study in the…….. between men and women, which is consistent with some previous studies..
14. In the conclusion section the author mentions the result, not a conclusion.
Examples are given to guide the authors. I hope the authors correct the manuscript properly.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 1 Oct 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors should correct all comments made by reviewers and review the manuscript by an English Expert Language.
With regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 1 Oct 2021

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs revisions. you should revise it exactly based on our reviewers' comments then English edit and resbmit. Please see the attached file and consider your amendment.
With regards,

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, Here is our Response to Reviewer's comments: The corrected parts are painted red in the article.

.

Reviewer 1: Q1: [*Abstract is very long should be short.*?], R1: [edited], line number: 5-31

Q2: [*Key words should be revise. The author should not be use abbreviation*], R2: edited], line number:29-30

Q3: [*Result section should be writing short. it is very long and the author should be mention only important notes*?], R3: [edited], line number:120-151

Q4: [*Discussion section should be writing short and should be correct. The author did not change this section.*

?], R4: [edited], line number:153-257

Reviewer 2: Q1: [*The title needs to be modified: Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome and Related Factors in Patients with Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver..*], R1: [edited], line number: 1-2

Q2: [*The abstract is very long. The volume of the abstract should be 250 words. It is not necessary to list all the results in the abstract. Only the main results should be reported in the abstract. The same goes for the method.*, R2: [edited], line number: 5-31

Q3: [*What does this sentence mean? "the results show that the mean age was not between the three grades of fatty liver (p = 0.026)e*?], R3: [edited], line number: deleted in showed table 1

Q4: [*In line 29, this sentence should be corrected. "There was no statistically significant relationship between BP, TG, HDL, FBS and waist circumference with different grades of fatty liver (p<0.05)" If there is no statistical difference, why is P reported significant?*], R4: [edited], line number: 22-23

Q5: [*In the conclusion section the author mentions the result, not a conclusion.*], R5: 24-28

Q6: [*This sentence should be corrected in lines 136 and 137: "The results show that there is a correlation significant difference between age with three grades of the fatty liver". Must be written: The results show that there is a statistically significant difference between age groups based on fatty liver rating..*?], R6: [edited], line number:125-127

Q7: [*Modify table titles..?*], R7: [edited], line number: modified

Q8: *Correct the way sentences are written in the text, can the two words "difference" and "correlation" come together??????? Lines 134 to 175 need major grammatical corrections. For example, "The results of the study show that there is no statistically significant difference between women and men in terms of the duration of diagnosis of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease."*.], R8: [edited]

Q9: [*Lines 121 to 124 are grammatically incorrect..*], R9: [edited], line number: 113-117

q10: The article needs a literary and grammatical edition..], R10: [edited

Q11: [*Lines 128 to 132 need to be modified. Where is this information reported?.*], R11: line number: showed table 1

Q12: [*Discussion needs to be reconsidered. The authors only mention the result but do not discuss them, except in some places. Lines 177 to 194 – 204-219 need to be modified..*], R11: [edited], line number:153-168, 178-182,186-187

Q13: [*Briefly report the results of your study, then compare with similar studies. P values should not be mentioned in the discussion. P values are for the results section of the article. For example, No significant difference was observed in this study in the…….. between men and women, which is consistent with some previous studies...*], R11: [deleted *P values*

Q14: [*In the conclusion section the author mentions the result, not a conclusion.*], R11: [edited], line number:259-263

best regards

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 10 Nov 2021

Dear Author,
this manuscript in the current format is acceptable. Please correct your tables as I had written for you mean and standard deviation should be as 1 column (M ± SD) and frequency and percent as 1 column as F(%). you should correct it on the proof stage.
With regards