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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/mejrh.111917
Published in: Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies: 8(4); e111917

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Second-Trimester Maternal Serum AFP Value in the Detection of Congenital Heart Defects"

Author(s): Shahrzad Aghaamoo, Maryam Lotfi, Majid Mirmohammadkhani, Mohammad Nasir Hemmatian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 10 Oct 2021
Accepted Date: 11 Oct 2021

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) 31 Dec 2020

Dear AE
my comments for the authors:
Decreased AFP has other causes, it is important to note that the fetus does not have genetic, chromosomal, or other abnormalities.
Because if there is an underlying problem, the test is not reliable.
The sample size in this case is small, if it is more, it is more reliable.
Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Feb 2021

Dear Associate Editor
The paper is interesting and deals with a relevant subject. A few points should be clarified and corrected. They are:
- Keywords should be selected from Mesh.
- Abbreviations should be explained.

- Please use the newest article in your reference.
- Please explain about how you reached this cut-off of alfa fitoprotein in your study.
– Literature review should be improved by discussing more research.
thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 13 Feb 2021

Dear EIC
According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript needs to be revised to address all comments clearly.

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision (0)** 14 Feb 2021

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers comments, your manuscript needs to be revised minorly. Please response the reviewer comments accurately and also edit the manuscript by native English editor. Some grammatical problems are observed in your manuscript.
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.

In the Name of God

Dear Editor-in-Chief
Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies

I send you a copy of my article titled: Evaluation of second trimester maternal serum AFP value in detecting of fetus with congenital heart defects in women who referred to Amir Al-Momenin hospital, Semnan-Iran; 2017-18, after revision based on Reviewers' Comments.

Responses to Reviewers

Reviewer 1:

	Reviewer Comment	Response to Reviewer
1	Decrease AFP have other causes, it is important to note that the fetus does not have genetic, chromosamal, other abnormalities. Because if there is an underlying problem, the test is not reliable.	All of the mentioned items, including chromosomal and genetic problems and other abnormalities accounted as exclusion criteria. This matter explained in method section and highlighted.
2	The sample size in case is small; if it is more, it is more reliable.	This was not possible due to the available cases.

Reviewer 2:

	Reviewer Comment	Response to Reviewer
1	Keywords should be select from Mesh	Keywords are corrected based on Mesh database and inserted in "Keywords" section and highlighted.
2	Abbreviations should be explained	All abbreviations presented as complete form for first time and highlighted, then present as abbreviations
3	Please used the newest article in your reference	We used the newest article in reference (No: 21-23)
4	Please explained about how you reached this cut off of Alfa-fitoprotein in your study	We reached to this cut-off point by calculating of **Area Under the Curve,** Specificity and

		Sensitivity for Alfa-fetoprotein in predicting of congenital heart defects.
5	Literature review should be improved by discussing more researches	We added some new article to "Discussion" and highlighted (No: 21-23).

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) 3 Aug 2021

Dear Editor
It is approved according to the change made.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 Aug 2021

Accepted

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 Aug 2021

Dear Chief Editor
My comments:
thank the authors for submitting the manuscript to MEJRH.
According to the reviewer's comments, the manuscript is ready for publication now
Also, please review and correct the following:
- Provide your link for the ethics code.
- "No conflict is reported from the authors" What do you mean? Please refer to the following section to complete this section:
Instructions for Authors - submission - Publication Ethics: Rules and Policies - Conflicts of Interest (CoI)

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 Aug 2021

Dear Authors
Thank you for improving of quality of the article. However, some grammatical problems are still observed in the manuscript. It is suggested that the article be edited by the native editor and sent the confirmation letter to the journal.
It is also recommended that the title of the manuscript be revised to be more clear about the aim of the study's evaluation. In addition, the location of the study is deleted from the tile.
Thanks

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.

In the Name of God

Dear Editor-in-Chief
Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies

I send you a copy of my article titled: **Evaluation of second trimester maternal serum AFP value in detecting of congenital heart**, after revision based on Editor's Comments.

Responses to Editor

	Comment	Response
1	Provide link for ethics code	The unique code assigned by the Ethics Committee of Semnan University of Medical Sciences is IR.SEMUMS.REC.1396.25.
2	Conflicts of Interest	This section corrected as below: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

In addition, I revised the manuscript text and title.

Sincerely

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 11 Oct 2021

Dear EIC
The manuscript is ready for publishing.
but please "Provide the link for the ethics code".
thanks

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision** (2) 11 Oct 2021

Dear Authors
We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in the MEJRHS. We hope to receive the other qualified articles from your research group. Please just provide the link of ethics code for publication of your manuscript.
Best regards