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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.98882
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 9(1); e98882

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Von Willebrand Antigen on Mortality and Major Adverse Cardiac Events in Diabetic and Non-diabetic Patients with Anterior ST Elevated Myocardial Infarction"

Author(s): Seyed Masoud Seyedian, Fatemeh Soltani, Najmaldin Saki, Golshan Afshari, Habib Haybar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	14 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	8 Jan 2020
Accepted Date:	21 Jan 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) — 29 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Plagiarism detection in the manuscript:I cannot do
2- Analysis method of the manuscript: How to assay the VWF antigen? The author should write about this and mention the kind of analysis and kit.
3- Results: Table1. Patients' characteristics is not clear.
4- Correct referencing and citations: correct
5- Correct and proper English writing: This needs some editing
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 1 Jan 2020

Dear AE,

It is valuable article. My comments to the article as the followed:

1- The grammatical and writing errors should be correct.

2- the other risk factors and Interfering factors didn't consider in the study.

3- In the study design matching between the Diabetic and non diabetic patients didn't mentioned.

4- The VWF is acute phase protein and affected by many situations, How the authors control that conditions between two groups of study population?

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,

Thanks for submitting this nice manuscript in the JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs some minor revisions in some parts. One of the honorable reviewers attached a file that the authors should pay attention to it while revising their manuscript. I think this manuscript has potentiality for publication if revise by authors.

With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Jan 2020

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. I recommend you revise the manuscript and resubmit as soon as possible.

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.

Reviewer 1:
1-Plagiarism detection in the manuscript:I cannot do

Answer: we checked for it.

2-Analysis method of the manuscript: How to assay the VWF antigen?The author should write about this and mention the kind of analysis and kit.

Answer: thanks for mentioning this section, we added this section and the change is made by red.
3-Results: Table1. Patients characteristics is not clear.

Answer: we checked for patients characteristics. They are clear please if you want us to change the table tell us how to change it.
4-Correct referencing and citations: correct

Answer: we checked the references and correct the citation with endnote.
5-Correct and proper English writing: This needs some editing

Answer: thanks for your attention we revised it and the changes are made by red.
Reviewer 2:
It is valuable article. My comments to the article as the followed:
1- The grammatical and writing errors should be correct.

Answer: dear reviewer we revised it and the changes are made by red.
2- the other risk factors and Interfering factors didn't consider in the study.

Answer: the study was general and we used the mentioned information in the documents.
3- In the study design matching between the Diabetic and non diabetic patients didn't mentioned.

Answer:we used glocuse test and their history.
4- The VWF is acute phase protein and affected by many situations, How the authors control that conditions between two groups of study population?

Answer: the patients did not have any infection or other disease.

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) 20 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Jan 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
This manuscript in the current format is acceptable. You should add the author's contribution end of your manuscript when the proof will be ready.
Thank you very much indeed.