**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.103177
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: In Press(In Press); e103177

# Peer Review Report for "The Comparison of Pediatric Quality Of Life in 8 - 12-Year-Old Asthmatic Children Versus Healthy Controls"

**Author(s):** Farhad Abolnezhadian, Soheila Sabzali, Seyed Mohammadreza Mirkarimi

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 31 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 11 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 24 Jan 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) — 20 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
1. Revise the title based on aim of the study (comparison of pediatric QOL in asthmatic children versus health control).
2. Replace QOL by “Quality Of Life” in the title.
3. Show very small P-values as <0.001
4. Why the total score of Peds QL ranging from −100 to +100? (23 questions with 0 to 5 scores).
5. 5-point or 6-point scale: 0 (Never), 1 (Rarely), 2 (Sometimes), 3 (Often), 4 (Almost) and 5 (Always)?
6. No significant difference was found between the two groups for sex, maternal education, family income (p <0.05)? But P<0.05 is significant.
7. Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary.
8. In Table 3, report median (IQR).
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 May 2020

Dear AE,

The design of this study is a case control one so the authors should consider some points in the method:
1- change the type of study to case control
2- explain about sample size
3- explain the sampling of cases and randomization of control patients
4- validity of questionnaire was not clear
In this study confounding factors and selection bias are very important so it is necessary to consider them in method and discussion
Limitations are not mentioned.
with thanks

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting this manuscript to SEMJ, the following comments should be addressed by the authors:
- This study has no novelty in method or results. many studies were done on the quality of life of children in Iran but, Please revise these items:
- Please do the English edition
- Please revise title
- Please revise the introduction, show the importance of this study and questionnaires should be explained in the method
- Please explain the method of sampling and sample size
- Please explain about the scoring of peds QL -100 to +100
- Please write ethic code in the method
- Please revise the subtitles of the result part all of them is inappropriate
- Please revise the type of study. This is a cross-sectional study and it is not prospective.
- What do you mean about “clinical trial” in this sentences “Our patient-responded outcomes associated with children's health-related Quality of life (HRQOL) clinical trial extracted from the robust”
- Please explain about” longitudinal patient-reported” in 3.2. Was your study a longitudinal observational study? You do not explain in the method part it seems to be a cross-sectional study
- Please revise the title of 3.1 and table 1: trial is not the appropriate word
- Tables need revision, what is the meaning of health in the column, you can use healthy and patients group or case and control
- Please revise table 4. You should write Mean ± SD respectively
- Please write about the limitations of your study
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 May 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

**Questions related to Reviewer 1:**
Q1. Revise the title based on aim of the study (comparison of pediatric QOL in asthmatic children versus health control).
Q 2. Replace QOL by “Quality Of Life” in the title.
Q 3. Show very small P-values as <0.001
Q 4. Why the total score of Peds QL ranging from −100 to +100? (23 questions with 0 to 5 scores).
Q 5. 5-point or 6-point scale: 0 (Never), 1 (Rarely), 2 (Sometimes), 3 (Often), 4 (Almost) and 5 (Always)?
Q 6. No significant difference was found between the two groups for sex, maternal education, family income (p <0.05)? But P<0.05 is significant.
Q 7. Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary.
Q 8. In Table 3, report median (IQR).

Response related to Reviewer 1: All of the above comments were corrected in the edited version of the article

***Questions related to Reviewer 2:***
The design of this study is a case control one so please consider some points in the method:
Q1- change the type of study to case control

R1: our study was an analytic cross-sectional study
Q2- explain about sample size

R2: With reference to reference number 13, the mean and standard deviation of quality of life in asthmatic patients was equal to 5.41± 8.88 and in healthy individuals was 20.99 ± 12.54. Considering the researcher's opinion that the difference of 6 units is clinically important, so determining the sample size in each group by considering $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.1$ in each group was equal to 60 people, which according to the method sampling and referring to the article "**sample size estimation and power analysis for clinical research study**", the sample size was multiplied by a factor of 1.5 and finally 100 people in each group were considered as the final sample size.

Q3- explain the sampling of cases and randomization of control patients
Q4- validity of questionnaire was not clear
Q5-In this study confounding factors and selection bias are very important so it is necessary to consider them in method and discussion

*R5:* Selection bias is a particular problem inherent in case-control studies, where it gives rise to non-comparability between cases and controls, while our study was an analytic cross-sectional study. Contrary to our study, confounding provides an alternative explanation for an association between an exposure (X) and an outcome in case-control studies.

*Q6-Limitations are not mentioned.*

Response other questions related to Reviewer 2: All of the above comments were corrected in the edited version of the article

Associate Editor's Comments:

Questions related to Associate Editor 1:
Dear author thank you for submitting your manuscript in SEMJ
Q 1.This study has no novelty in method or results . many studies were done on quality of life of children in Iran but, Please revise these items:
Q 2.Please do English edition
Q 3. Please revise title
Q 4. Please revise introduction, show the importance of this study and questionnaires should be explained in method
Q 5. Please explain about the method of sampling and sample size

R5: With reference to reference number 13, the mean and standard deviation of quality of life in asthmatic patients was equal to 5.41± 8.88 and in healthy individuals was 20.99 ± 12.54. Considering the researcher's opinion that the difference of 6 units is clinically important, so determining the sample size in each group by considering $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.1$ in each group was equal to 60 people, which according to the method sampling and referring to the article "sample size estimation and power analysis for clinical research study", the sample size was multiplied by a factor of 1.5 and finally 100 people in each group were considered as the final sample size.

Q 6.Please explain about scoring of peds QL -100 to +100

R6: This disease-specific PedsQL questionnaire consisted of 23 items associated with four dimensions that contained physical performance (eight items), emotional performance (five issues), social performance (five issues), and academic achievement (five issues). Both of the psychological health and physical activity subscales are composed of summation of the scores assigned to emotional performance, activity in the school, social functioning, and physical functioning in daily activities, respectively, and the total score (ranging from 23-115) can also be calculated by this PedsQL model.

Q 7.. Please write ethic code in method
Q 8. Please revise subtitles of result part all of them is inappropriate
Q 9.. Please revise the type of study .This is a cross sectional study and it is not prospective.
Q 10.. What do you mean about “clinical trial” in this sentences “Our patient-responded outcomes associated with children's health-related Quality of life (HRQOL) clinical trial extracted from the robust”

Q 11.Please explain about" longitudinal patient-reported" in 3.2. Was your study longitudinal observational study? You do not explain in method part it seems to be a cross sectional study

Q 12.Please revise the title of 3.1 and table 1: trial is not appropriate word
Q 13.Tables need revision, what is the meaning of health in column, you can use healthy and patients group or case and control
Q 14.Please revise table 4. You should write Mean ± SD respectively
Q 15. Please write about the limitations of your study

Response other questions related to Associate Editor: All of the above comments were corrected in the edited version of the article

**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) 18 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Show very small P-values as <0.001
2. Justify sample size using information of previous studies.
3. In Table 3, report median (IQR).
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 26 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
According to the revised manuscript , the manuscript is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the revision of the manuscript but it needs more revision by the authors:
* Some sentences such as 'The first questionnaire was related to clinical participants and demographic information" need English edition
* Title needs English edition. what is the meaning of health in the title?
* Demographics and clinical information of participants was collected by using the checklist
* Please explain about sample size in method
* Please revise tables the unit of variables such as mean±SD or n(%) should be mentioned in tables
* Title of tables needs revision.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 13 Nov 2020

Dear Authors,
Revision is needed.
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.

**Reviewers' Comments:**

*Reviewer 1:*
*Q1. Show very small P-values as <0.001*

*R1:* This comment was corrected in the edited abstract and main text.

*Q2. Justify sample size using information of previous studies.*

R2: This comment was inserted in the research design and sampling techniques section of material and method.

*Q3. In Table 3, report median (IQR).*

*R3:* This was corrected in table 3

*Reviewer 2:*
*according to revised manuscript , the manuscript is suitable for publication*

*Associate Editor's Comments:*

*Associate Editor 1:*
*Dear author thank you for revision of manuscript but it needs more revision*
*Q1:* some sentences such as 'The first questionnaire was related to clinical participants and demographic information" need English edition*

R1: All of the sections of this manuscript was revised twice and this comment was corrected as the first questionnaire was related to clinical and demographic data associated with both experimental groups, and the second questionnaire was contributed to participants' related quality of life (QoL) issues.
*Q2:*Title need English edition. what is the meaning of health in title?*

R2: This comment was corrected in the edited title of the manuscript
*Q3:*Demographic and clinical information of participants was collected by using checklist*

*R3:* This comment was corrected as the current study's data was collected using a list of current demographic and clinical data in the form of a self-administered questionnaire
*Q4:*please explain about sample size in method*

R4: This comment was inserted in the research design and sampling techniques section of material and method.

*Q5:*please revise tables the unit of variables such as mean±SD or n(%) should mentioned in tables*

*R5:* This was corrected in all tables

*Q6:*title of tables need revision*

*R6*: This comment was corrected in all titles of tables

**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**: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 4 Dec 2020

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

**Mahnaz Yadollahi**: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 29 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for choosing me as a reviewer. I think you did not send me the last version of this manuscript but I found it. The authors corrected the comment and now this manuscript now is ready for publication.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 5 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors should revise these items:
- Please revise this sentence and omit experimental word because this study is not an interventional study ” The first questionnaire was related 90 to clinical and demographic data associated with both experimental groups”
- Table 4: mean ±SD should be written in the table in front of Aspects of QOL.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 7 Jan 2021

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 (3)

## 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 Soheila Sabzali,**

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. We would like to inform you that the peer review of your manuscript is now completed and despite several useful points, it needs "**Minor Revision**". Below you may find the peer review comments. Please reply to them one-by-one and re-submit it again.

**Reviewers' Comments:**

*Reviewer 1:*
*Dear Editor :*
*thanks for choosing me as reviewer. I think you didnot send me the last version of this manuscript but i found it .the authors corrected the comment and now this manuscript now is ready for publication .*
*Reviewer 2:*
*Accept*

**Associate Editor's Comments:**

*Associate Editor 1:*
*Dear author please revise these items:*
*Please revise this sentence and omit experimental word because this study is not interventional study ”*
*The first questionnaire was related 90 to clinical and demographic data associated with both experimental groups”*

*Table4: mean ±SD should be written in table in front of Aspects of QOL*

These comments were corrected in the edited title of the manuscript

**OPEN PEER REVIEW**

**Revision (3)**

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (3) 24 Jan 2021

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