Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 11 · Issue 2 · e122042

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Serum Levels of Interlukine-17A (IL-17A), Fibrinogen, and Red Distribution Width (RDW) in Patients with Coronary Artery Ectasia, Candidate for Coronary Angiography: A Cross-Sectional Study

Morteza Mashoughi, Abbas Mohagheghi Dare Ranj, Zeynab Hasansagha

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 Dec 2021	14 Feb 2022	15 Feb 2022	10.5812/jjcdc-122042

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 12
5 **Revision 4** Editor-in-Chief 13
Authors' reply to reviewers 14
Reviewer and editor comments 15

1 Original submission

1 comment · 7 Jan 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 7 Jan 2022

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the JJCDC. First, you should consult the JJCDC guideline and see the published article for the correct format of the manuscript. Based on our reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs some revision in all sections. I have attached one PDF file with comments in Persian; you should pay attention to all of these comments. Please find the attached file and amend your manuscript based on it.
With regards.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor, we highlight the changes in the manuscript, also refereed and cited to some article related published in jundishapur university of medical science.

Reviewer 1:
Hello dear,
I'm glad to have the opportunity to review this article. The article has the following weaknesses in order to improve your article:

1- You mentioned in the introduction that various studies have increased the three variables mentioned in coronary heart disease, so what is the need for this study when there is conclusive evidence?

Answer: Dear reviewer, until now, no study has been performed that simultaneously evaluated three factors IL-17A, fibrinogen, and RDW in patients, and only one of the three factors (IL-17A, fibrinogen, and RDW) has been studied in each study. In this study, for the first time, we evaluated simultaneously three factors in patients and their relationship with clinical and laboratory processes of patients.
2- In the first paragraph, mention the prevalence of coronary artery ectasia and heart disease in Iran after the world.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added some sentence.
3- In my opinion, this is not a case-control study because the study is not retrospective at all. Your study is done. This is a feature of case-control studies (group matching, control of confounding variables, and period under review or follow-up). So study design needs serious revision.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we changed type of study
4- The sample size determination formula should be mentioned along with all the statistical parameters used.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added sample size formula in the text.
5- What is the study period?

Answer: Dear reviewer, this study conducted between 2020-2021 years that inserted in the main text.
6- Where was the setting used?

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added in the text location of study. This study conducted in shariati hospital of Tehran university of medical science.
7- The method of obtaining informed consent is not mentioned in the method.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added your comment in the method section.
8- It is necessary to explain each of the studied variables in the method.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added some sentence about variables in the method section.
9- Name the tools you used to measure the variables.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added name of tools that measure the variables.
10- List the limitations of the present study at the end of the discussion.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added some sentence to the main text.

11- The conclusion is very brief. In conclusion, you should point out the main findings associated with the application of this study to experts, researchers, and policymakers.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we mentioned result of this study in the conclusion section.

12- Mention suggestions for future studies.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added some sentence to the main text.

13- In the discussion, compare the findings of your study with the results of other studies and mention the main causes of heterogeneity and differences.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we compare my result from similar other articles and most result of article similar to my result.

14- Despite similar studies around the world, I have not yet realized the importance and necessity of doing this. It needs to be reviewed by the respected researcher in the introduction and discussion section.

Answer: Dear reviewer, Answer: Dear reviewer, until now, no study has been performed that simultaneously evaluated three factors IL-17A, fibrinogen, and RDW in patients, and only one of the three factors (IL-17A, fibrinogen, and RDW) has been studied in each study. In this study, for the first time, we evaluated simultaneously three factors in patients and their relationship with clinical and laboratory processes of patients.

15- I did not understand these three variables are used to diagnose the disease or screening. Explain more about this. If they are used for diagnosis, then you should consider the advantages of this method compared to other diagnostic methods.

Answer: Dear reviewer, we added some sentence to the conclusion section.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 1 Feb 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 1 Feb 2022

Dear Author,
Based on reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs a minor revision. Please pay attention to all comments and resubmit the revised version.
With regards.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor, we highlight the changes in the manuscript, also refereed and cited to some article related published in jundishapur university of medical science.

Reviewer 1:
Hello dear editor,
The requested corrections have been applied.
After the final opinion of the chief editor, the article can be accepted.

thanks a lot.
Reviewer 2:
Dear Editor
Hello
I'm glad to have the opportunity to review this article.
Most of the points mentioned by the Reviewers have been corrected, in addition the following points is suggested;
It is better to mention the odds ratio (OR) for each of the main variables. Such interpretations will be more valuable.

Answer: dear editor , following reviewer comment, we added OR to the table.
Sampling method should be mentioned

Answer: dear reviewer, we added some sentence to the method section.
Best regards
Mohammad Adineh

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 6 Feb 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 6 Feb 2022

Dear Author,
Thank you for revising your manuscript. There are some comments that I wrote in the PDF file attached to these comments. Please find the attached file and use it to make corrections.
With regards.

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor, we highlight the changes in the manuscript, also refereed and cited to some article related published in jundishapur university of medical science.

Dear Editor
Hello

The article can be accepted, but the authors please note the following.
Mentioning the odds ratio in the tables alone is not enough and its interpretation should be discussed in the results and discussion.

Answer: dear reviewer, we added some sentence about OR in result and discussion section.

Associate Editor 1:
Dear authors

Read the author guide again, then reorganize your own manuscript properly for this journal. (E.g. Head titles of each section, flow chart of the study, research highlights, tables, etc.) For this reason please have a look at previously published articles in JJCDC.

Answer: dear editor, we reorganize the manuscript according instruction for authors.

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 11 Feb 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 11 Feb 2022

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions in all parts of it. Please find the attached file and revise your manuscript based on that file. I recommend you revise the manuscript and resubmit.
With regards.

5

Revision 4

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

5 Revision 4

1 comment · 15 Feb 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 15 Feb 2022

Dear Author,
Thank you for revising your manuscript. This manuscript in its current format is acceptable for publication. Based on our guideline, you should correct the end of your manuscript regarding support and funding because you obtained ethical code IR.TUMS.THC.REC.1399.050 from TUMS; therefore, you should cite the name of Tehran University of Medical Sciences as a supporter of your study.
Thank you