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.94256
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 9(3); e94256

Peer Review Report for "Social Support Levels in Children with Type 1 Diabetes or Epilepsy in Bursa, Turkey"

Author(s): Elanur Korucu, Nurcan Özyazıcıoğlu, Meryem Atak, Ceyhun Manavoğlu

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 19 May 2020
Accepted Date: 20 May 2020

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) 18 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this manuscript to this journal. There are some comments in my opinion to the article
- "Determination of Social Support Levels of The Children With Type 1 Diabetes or Epilepsy" how you determined the sample size?
- What are inclusion criteria?
- Please mention the study year in the method section.
- Mention implication for future studies.
Thank you so much

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for sending me a manuscript with title: Determination of Social Support Levels of The Children With Type 1 Diabetes or Epilepsy. it should be noted that this manuscript is very interesting and can be published after some revisions.

Abstract:
- Please explain more about background of your study. it is about why did you have researched it.
- Please explain the sampling method in the method of abstract.
Introduction(Background):
- Why did you study 2 diseases? what is similarity of diabetics and epilepsy in children, please explain about similarity of that diseases.
Methods:
- Please explain inclusion and exclusion criteria
- You should mention kind of sampling method. probability or non probability?
- Please mention calculation of sample volume.
- Please write about ethical consideration and code of ethics
Results:
- In table 1 please mention percents of numbers.
- Please mention the table in text. you draw a table but didn't mention in the text!.
Discussion:
- Please bring some new related papers with diabetics and epilepsy social support for confirmation your results.
- Please mention the limitation of your study.
Thank you.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting this manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments the article needs some revisions in all parts.
With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 22 Feb 2020

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. I recommend you revise the manuscript and turn it back as soon as.
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,

According to your suggestions, we've made the necessary corrections. We have new additions

and proofreading (yellow writing).

Thanks

Abstract: *-Please explain more about background of your study. it is about why did you have researched it.*	**Added as** Social support affects the course of the disease in children with type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) or epilepsy.
please explain sampling method in the method of abstract.	**Deleted** A total of 100 children with epilepsy or type 1 diabetes who were at the ages of 11-17 and applied to the outpatient clinics of Pediatric Endocrinology and Pediatric Neurology. **Added as** The sample consisted of a total of 100 children aged 11-17 with 50 diabetes and 50 epilepsy. No sample calculation was made in the study. The study was completed with 100 children who met the inclusion requirements
Introduction(Background):why did you study 2 diseases? what is similarity of diabetics and epilepsy in children, please explain about similarity of that diseases.	**In manuscript** In children with DM or epilepsy which are common chronic diseases in children, perceived social support also affects the courses of these diseases.
Methods: *-Please explain inclusion and exclusion criteria*	**Added as** Inclusion criteria; - patients aged between 11-17 years old, - no other chronic illnesses, - at least going to 4th grade in primary school.
you should mention kind of sampling method. probability or non probability?	
Please mention calculation of sample volume.	
please write about ethical consideration and code of ethics	
Results: *-in the table 1 please mention percents of numbers.*	**Deleted** The mean age of the children was 14.10±2.03, the mean duration of the disease was

please mention table in text. you draw a table but didn't mention in the text!.	6.22±4.15. While 69% of the mothers were housewives while 31% of them were employed. 8% of the fathers were retired; 73% of them were civil servants-workers; 19% of them were self-employed. **Added as** in the table 1 please mention percents of numbers.
Discussion: *-please bring some new related papers with diabetics and epilepsy social support for confirmation your results.*	
please mention limitation of your study.	**In manuscript** Study Limitations The fact that the study was conducted with the children with epilepsy and type 1 diabetes, who were at the ages of 11-17 years old, who applied to the pediatric endocrinology and pediatric neurology outpatient clinics of the Department of Pediatrics in the hospital where the study is conducted, is a limititation of the study. Therefore, the results obtained from the study can be generalized to the children with epilepsy and type 1 diabetes in this study group.

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) — 11 May 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript is acceptable in the current acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 11 May 2020

Dear EIC,
All comments were corrected.
Thank you

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 11 May 2020

Dear Author,
This manuscript is acceptable in the current format. you should write number of ethical code in the proof version. There is some errors in the tables please correct tables. I attached your manuscript and provide comment on pdf file. please pay attention to all comments. and resubmit as soon possible.
Thank you very much.

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,

We eliminated the differences between the table and the text. We removed texts not shown in the table

Results: *please mention table in text. you draw a table but didn't mention in the text!.*	**Deleted** While 69% of the mothers were housewives while 31% of them were employed. 8% of the fathers were retired; 73% of them were civil servants-workers; 19% of them were self-employed.

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) 20 May 2020

Dear Author,
This manuscript in the current format is acceptable for publication.
with regards