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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.104751
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(7); e104751

Peer Review Report for "Serum Vitamin D3 Levels in Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia and Its Relevance with Clinical Prognostic Factors"

Author(s): Mehdi Dehghani, Anush Khajeh, Reza Vojdani, Mozhdeh Sanei, Pedram Keshavarz, Nasrin Namdari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 May 2020
Revised Date: 16 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 20 Aug 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) — 21 May 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authros:
1. Define “CLL” for the first time in the abstract.
2. Replace “P= 0.000” by “P<0.001”.
3. Mean of standard deviation is not true.
4. Appropriate descriptive statistics for non-parametric tests are median (IQR).
5. There was no information about sample size calculation.
6. Change “meaningful” to “statistically significant”.
7. Report all the P-values as “P=??”
8. What do you mean by “was comparable with”?
9. Figure 1 is not about correlation.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 11 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The article has major problems in statically analysis and categorization of patients.
Because of the major consideration of static analysis, this manuscript needs major revision.
If some correction in static analysis performs this manuscript can be published.
Especially, some variable such as risk categorization according to cytogenetic study should be done.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 12 Jul 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.

Answer to reviewers':

Reviewer 1:

Comment: Define “CLL” for the first time in the abstract.

Answer: Thanks, it was changed to chronic lymphocytic leukemia(CLL).

Comment: Replace “P= 0.000” by “P<0.001”.

Answer: It was corrected

Comment: Mean of standard deviation is not true.

Answer: Thank you for good comment it was corrected to the mean ± standard deviation (SD) or mean (IQR).

Comment: Appropriate descriptive statistics for non-parametric tests are median (IQR).

Answer: Thank you, it was corrected

Comment: There was no information about sample size calculation.

Answer: This study was performed on patients who referred to the oncology clinic within one year, so the sample size was not necessary.

Comment: Change “meaningful” to “statistically significant”.

Answer: It was corrected

Comment: Report all the P-values as “P=??”

Answer: It was corrected

Comment: What do you mean by “was comparable with”?

Answer: Than you, it was corrected: The mean 25OHVitD3 level in control group was 47.77±25.69 ng/ml that was higher in CLL group (28.66±17.52 ng/ml).

Comment: Figure 1 is not about correlation.

Answer: It was corrected and changed to **The level of 25OHVitD3 in all stages of CLL**

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

The article has major problem in statically analysis and categorization of patients.

Because of major consideration about statically analysis this manuscript need major revision

If some correction in statically analysis perform this manuscript can published

Specially, some variable such as risk categorization according to cytogenetic study should be

Done

Answer to associate Editor's Comments:

Thank you for your good suggestion, but unfortunately, performing cytogenetic examination in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia as a risk factor in patients is very costly, which could not be done in our center. However, the title of the article is only correlation to clinical risk factors in CLL and cytogenetic study in this article is not included. However according to your suggestion and if you agree, we can change the title to 'Serum vitamin-D3 level in chronic lymphocytic leukemia and its relevance with different stage of disease'

EIC Decision:

Needs major revision .

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)** 20 Aug 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.