Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 13 · Issue 3 · e141674

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Relationship Between Body Mass Index and Blood Lipids with Kidney Stone Disease: The Fasa Adults Cohort Study

Behina Babaalizadeh, Ali Taghinezhad, Mostafa Bijani, Azizallah Dehghan

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11 Nov 2023 | 21 Mar 2024 | 23 Mar 2024 | 10.5812/jjcdc-141674 |

## 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** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 3
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 4
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 6

## 1 Original submission

2 comments · 4 Mar 2024 – 4 Mar 2024

### Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 4 Mar 2024

Dear Author,
• Please check your keywords against the MeSH database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions.
• The results in the abstract are poor. There should be more explanation of your findings, for example, demographic data and your population.
• Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction.
• The design of the study has not been explained clearly. Please provide the number of cohorts. Over what period was this study conducted? Please describe.
• What was your sampling strategy? It is a critical point for external validity in your study. What are your exclusion criteria?
• The reliability and validity of the measurement tools were unknown.
• There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.
• Please mention the limitations and strong points of your study. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion.
Thank you

### Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 4 Mar 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions in all sections. Please use previously published related articles in your references. I recommend you revise the manuscript and resubmit it as soon as possible.
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.

**Hello and respect. Thank you for your valuable comments.**

**Reviewers' Comments:**

*Reviewer 1:*
*The article is well written, it is acceptable after minor corrections*

*1.In the abstract findings section, what is mean of each unit? It is unclear, please explain clearly*

*In the findings section of the abstract, it was modified. (line 25-27)*

*2.In the introduction of the article, please mention more and more accurate statistics of the studies conducted in this field and state the reason for conducting the present study more strongly.*

*It was done in lines 37 to 41.*

*3.In the methodology, the exact steps of conducting the research are not mentioned. Please describe it step by step. (such asThe time of sampling, the time of data collection, the time of completing the questionnaires,)*

*It was done in lines 71 to 80.*

---

**Associate Editor's Comments:**

*Associate Editor 1:*
*Dear Author,*
*• Please check your Keywords with the Mesh database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions*

*Keywords were selected from the Mesh. (line 34)*

*• The result of the abstract is poor. It should be more explanation about your findings for example demographic data and your population.*

*Abstract findings were improved. (line 23-27)*

*• Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction.*

*It was done in text (line 66-69)*

*• The design of the study has not been explained clearly please bring a number of cohorts. how long this study has been done? please describe.*

*It was done in line 72-80*

*• What was your sampling strategy; it is a critical point for external validity in your study. What are your exclusion criteria?*

*It is explained in line 79*

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

*All the tools used were ordered by the central cohort team and had good validity and reliability. Also, trained interviewers were used to collect data.*

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

*Its improved.*

*• Please mention the limitations and strong points of your study. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion.*

*Limitation and strength of study is mentioned in line 164-173*
*Thank you*

## 2 Revision 1

2 comments · 23 Mar 2024 – 23 Mar 2024

### Associate Editor

ACCEPT 23 Mar 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for your correction. All comments have been addressed, and this manuscript could be acceptable.
thank you

### Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 23 Mar 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. All comments have been made, and this manuscript is acceptable in its current version.
Thank you