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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.100166
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(1); e100166

Peer Review Report for "Socioeconomic Status and Child Developmental Delay: A Prospective Cohort Study"

Author(s): Najmeh Maharlouei, Artin Sarkarinejad, Hadi Raeisi Shahraki, Abbas Rezaianzadeh, Kamran Bagheri Lankarani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 13 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 16 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 5 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for this valuable article. The authors should correct the Table 1 title. The content of this table is about both parents.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 11 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

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 Professor Lankarani

Thank you so much for giving us a second chance to revise our manuscript. Also, we would like to express our great appreciation to the respected reviewer, who devoted their time and energy to review our manuscript and send us his/her invaluable comments.

The comment was applied in the title of the Table 1 and it is shown in track change format.

Kindest Regards

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 16 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.