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.97382
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 9(1); e97382

Peer Review Report for "Allele and Genotype Frequencies of *CYP2C19* in Patients with Drug-Eluting Stents Following Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Southwest of Iran"

Author(s): Habib Haybar, Mohammad Mehdi Ghadiri, Pegah Ghandil, Ahmad Rouhizadeh, Ahmad Reza Asareh, Ata A. Ghadiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 23 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 13 Dec 2019

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)

14 Sep 2019

Dear Author

I thank you very much for submitting your manuscript to this journal. There are some comments in my opinion:

a) Please write a running title after the main title.

ABSTRACT
1- Check keywords with MeSH and revise them.

INTRODUCTION
The introduction should be in some paragraphs.
Discussion more about the challenge of your study in the last paragraph.

METHOD

1- Please write a structural method (write subheadings such as setting, measures, analysis method, and etc.). see other published articles of jjchronic journal.

2- Write ethical considerations in the separate sub-heading and mention ethics code.

3- Write the type of study in the method section.

4- How you determined sample size?

5- Mention inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Discussion

a- Write implications for practice and also for implication for future studies.

b- Mention limitation of study.

Thank you so much again.

Yours,

Elham Rajaei: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Oct 2019

The manuscript is interesting, but there are some comments to upgrade it.

1. Please declare in the text why this genotype is used?
2. Is there a similar study in the world?
3. Please mention the prevalence of this genotype in Asia.
4. What is the gain of this study?
5. The result is not well written.
6. How can we use CYP19 in pci patients?
7. Is there any study on the association of this genotype with drug-resistant in pci patients?
8. Please use updated references.
9. Please write the human right.
10. Is this a thesis? What is its number?
11. Please mention the conflict of interest.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Oct 2019

Dear Author,

Thanks for submitting the manuscript in the JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs some reversions in all parts. It is recommended to pay attention to all reviewers' comments and revise the manuscript then resubmit as soon as possible.

Best regards.

Kourosh Zarea: EIC | **Revision** (0) 21 Oct 2019

Dear Dr. Haybar,

Thanks for submitting this interesting study in JJCDC. We appreciate you as a scientist and

as our friend. As you know, our reviewers provide some comments that you should take care of that. We are waiting for your revised manuscript as soon as possible.

Kourosh Zarea

Best 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 Mr. Habib Haybar,

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript to our journal. We would like to inform you that the peer review process of your manuscript is complete and requires "**Major Revision**". Although it has several useful points, it needs **Major Revision** to be reviewed again. Below you can find the abstracts of the peer review decision made by our editorial board members.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
the manuscript is interesting but i suggest some comments to upgrade it.
1. in the text declare why you used this genotype?

Answer: we used this genotype because CYP2C19 *2 and *3 alleles are the most responsible for treatment response by anti-palate drugs.

2. is there a similar study in the world ?

Answer: yes. We mentioned them in the discussion.
3. mention the prevalent of this genotype in Asia.

Answer: it is 29-30% in Asian ethnicities we added this to the text .
4. what is the gain of this study?

Answer: we determined the frequencies of CYP2C19 polymorphisms in patients received Drug-Eluting Stents following PCI who living in the southwest of Iran.
5. the result is not well written.

Answer: we rewrite the result.
6. how can we use CYP19 in PCI patients?

Answer: we can estimate the therapeutic response in them.
7. is there any study on the association of this genotype with drug resistant in pci patients?

Answer: yes.
8. use updated references.

Answer: we used several references and added them to the text.
9. write the human right

Answer: we added this section to the manuscript.
10. is this a thesis?what is its number?

Answer: we added this section the change is made by red.
11. mention the conflict of interest

Answer: we added this section.
Reviewer 2:
Dear Author

I thank you very much for submitting your manuscript to this journal. There are some comments in my opinion:

a) Please write a running title after main title.

Answer: we added a running title. The change is made by red.

ABSTRACT
1- Check keywords with MeSH and revise them.
Answer: we rechecked them.
INTRODUCTION
Introduction should be in some paragraph.
Discussion more about challenge of your study in the last paragraph.

Answer: we mentioned our work at the end of the introduction.

METHOD
1- Please write a structural method (write subheadings such as setting, measures, analysis method, and etc.). see other published articles of jjchronic journal.

Answer: we made the change as you asked.
2- Write ethical consideration in the separate sub-heading and mention ethic code.

Answer: we add it to the end of the manuscript.
3- Write type of study in the method section.

Answer: we added this section.
4- How you determined sample size?

Answer: we used all the patients referred in this study
5- Mention inclusion and exclusion criteria.
we used patients undergoing pci. We did not used specific criteria.
Discussion

a- Write implication for practice and also for implication for future studies.

Answer: Since there is controversy in clopidogrel treatment strategy for patients who carry at least one of the non-functional CYP2C19 alleles, further studies with larger sample numbers should be performed to determine the prevalence of non-functional alleles in various populations and to attain an agreement about efficient treatment strategy.
b- Mention limitation of study.

Sample size.

Thank you so much again

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.

Elham Rajaei: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 1 Dec 2019

This article is accepted.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 13 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
This article is acceptable in the current format.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 13 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
This manuscript is acceptable in the current format.
Best regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
This manuscript is acceptable in the current format.
Thanks.