Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 13 · Issue 4 · e144094

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating the Prevalence of Protein S, Protein C, Factor V Leiden, and Homocysteine Disorders in Patients with Antiphospholipid Syndrome: A Retrospective Study

Ali Badfar, Najmaldin Saki, Forough Nakhostin, Alireza Ghanbaran, Elham Rajaei

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 Dec 2023	21 Apr 2024	21 Apr 2024	10.5812/jjcdc-144094

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** Akram Hemmatipour, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Akram Hemmatipour, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

2 comments · 20 Jan 2024 – 31 Jan 2024

Akram Hemmatipour Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 20 Jan 2024

Greetings.
The following points should be addressed in revising the manuscript:
In the Introduction section, use studies conducted in this field that are cited in the Discussion section, and emphasize the importance of the topic by providing more explanation of the research conducted and its effect on reducing complications.
Use references from the last 10 years.
In the Methods section, was a reference used for this checklist? Patient consent is not considered an inclusion criterion.
In the Results section, in consultation with a statistician, it would be better to present the demographic information in Table 1, except for age, as frequencies rather than means.
In the Discussion section, please avoid stating the results and significance levels, and explain the reasons for the differences and similarities between the cited studies and the present study.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 31 Jan 2024

Dear Author,
There are some minor comments that you should address when revising and resubmitting the manuscript.
Thank you

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.

Reviewer 1:
Greetings.
In the article, the following points are to be corrected:
In the Introduction section, use the articles that are mentioned in the Discussion and that have been conducted in this field, and highlight the importance of the topic with more explanation about the research work done and its effect on reducing complications.

Answer: Dear referee, changes have been made.

References from the last 10 years should be used.

Answer: Dear referee, changes have been made. There are about one or two old references that have been used in the discussion, so it was not possible to replace them due to the lack of a similar study.

In the Methods section, was a reference used for preparing this checklist? Patient consent is not considered an inclusion criterion.

Answer: Dear referee, changes have been made. The checklist was prepared by the researcher to extract the data of the patients.

In the Results section, for the demographic information in Table 1, in consultation with a statistician, except for the age variable, it is better to report the other items as frequencies, not means.

Answer: Dear referee, changes have been made.

In the Discussion section, please avoid mentioning results and significance levels, and explain the reason for the differences and similarities between the cited studies and the present study.

Answer: Dear referee, changes have been made.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 13 Apr 2024 – 18 Apr 2024

Akram Hemmatipour Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 13 Apr 2024

Greetings. Dear Editor,
The revisions have been made. Only the reporting of the tables needs editing, especially Table 1; the categorization of the variables must be based on a specific reference.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 18 Apr 2024

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewer's comments, your manuscript needs some revision in all sections. Please revise and resubmit.
Thank you.

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.

Greetings. To the respected Editor-in-Chief,

The corrections have been made. Only the reporting of the tables needs editing, particularly Table 1; the categorization of the variables should be based on a specific reference.

Answer: Thank you for your comment, dear referee, the demographic data of the patients is shown in table number one. In Table 1, according to the opinion of the judges in the first revision, all the variables have been expressed in terms of frequency and percentage. There are many variables. These demographic variables are given in the form of frequency or average in the articles and do not need to be referenced. In connection with the explanations of other tables, corrections were applied.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 21 Apr 2024

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 21 Apr 2024

Dear Author,
This manuscript in the current version is acceptable.
Thank you.