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

Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals
Article DOI: 10.5812/mca.106026
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: 12(1); e106026

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Factors Associated with Congenital Heart Disease"

Author(s): Parvin Akbari Asbagh, Ali Rabbani, Nahid Vafaei, Saeede Mohammadalizadeh Rastegar, Ehsan Aghaei Moghadam, Vida Hojati, Nastaran Etesamnia, Azin Ghamari, Ali Mohebbi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 10 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 17 Oct 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) — 7 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
In my opinion,from the point of view of the number of samples, it is a good article,but statistical analysis needs to be checked by a statistician. Also in the study,different types of congenital heart disease should be mentioned.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 18 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for inviting me.

Actually, this is a good and well-written article, but according to reviewers' comments, statistical analysis needs to be checked by a statistician.
Also in the study, different types of congenital heart disease should be mentioned.
And a careful English edition is needed too.
Thanks

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel: EIC | **Revision** (0) 19 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript. I would like to inform you that the article needs some revision according to the reviewers' comments before publication.
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 reviews,

We wanted to appreciate your detailed and professional points of view. We did our best to cover all your invaluable comment. We revised the manuscript entitled “Prevalence of factors associated with congenital heart disease” based on the comments. We hope to be acceptable. The changes applied based on the comments have been highlighted in the file and are:
Reviewer 2:

In my opinion, from the point of view of the number of samples, it is a good article, but statistical analysis needs to be checked by a statistician.

Our response: All data and analysis are reviewed by a statistician; no further changes are required in his opinion.

In the study, different types of congenital heart disease should be mentioned.

Our response: this part has been added in the results section:

The types of CHD were not different significantly between cases and controls ($P<0.05$); 41% had ventricular septal defects; 32% had atrial septal defect, 7.1% had aortic stenosis, 3.3% had transposition of the great arteries, 2.9% had single ventricle and 3.3% had complex CHD.

Kind Regards,

Ali Mohebbi, corresponding author

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) 13 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
One of the most important factors in this study is parents' consanguinity, as we know this parenting relationship is so common in Iran, but its prevalence is different in different parts of Iran, the writers should be explained about this confounding factor in the study.
and also the writers mentioned the types of CHD and write there is no difference between case and controls regarding CHD type, what is the meaning? there is no CHD in the control group.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Dr Mohebi and collaborators reported a cross-sectional case-control study on 1338 patients with congenital heart disease and investigated factors that could have an association with CHD. Considering the appropriate number of cases,
I believe this is a very good article.
I only have one question about the details and type of medications)other than multivitamins and folic acid) used in mothers in the control group.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
To me, this article is eligible for publication, just, please consider the type of medications other than multivitamins and folic acid in your paper galley proof.
Thanks.

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for revising your article. I would like to inform you that it is ready for publication at this stage, however, please consider the AE and reviewer's comments on your paper galley proof to accelerate the publication process.
Regards

Alireza A. Ghavidel MD