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.92718
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(4); e92718

Peer Review Report for "Breastfeeding, Serum Level of Hemoglobin and Ferritin Associated with the Risk of Asthma in Children: A Case-Control Study"

Author(s): Afsaneh Sadeghian, Fateme Moghaddam, Khatereh Babakhani, Saba Shakarami, Pouneh Zolfaghari , Mohammad Bagher Sohrabi , Mostafa Dianatinasab

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	30 Apr 2019
Revised Date:	22 Dec 2019
Accepted Date:	3 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 11 May 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. The present study examined 110 or 55 children aged 3 to 12 with asthma?
2. Reported information about sample size calculation are not enough.
3. Hb<11 for the ages 4–6 years, <11.5 g/dL for the ages 5–11?
4. Merge Tables 3 and 4.
5. Remove Table 5 and all the related information.
6. Report whole the results of regression model in a Table. How about variable selection technique?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
- There is a more important reason causing asthma than anemia like past history of atopy and family history of allergy will not be attended in this study.
- No differentiation is seen between asthma and wheezing-associated lower respiratory tract

infection while later is a common disease in this range of age (3-12 years old).
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 30 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
Thank you for inviting me as an AE of the manuscript entitled "Breastfeeding, Serum level of Hemoglobin and Ferritin Associated with the Risk of Asthma in Children: A Case–Control Study".
This manuscript does not consider the main confounder including the socio-economic status of the family, family history of allergy in the family, and history of respiratory tract infection in early childhood. If the authors have this information, the manuscript could be reanalysis while considering the mentioned confounders.
Kindest Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 1 Aug 2019

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.

Ref: 92718.R1
Dear Editor of *Shiraz E-Medical Journal*

Thank you for the recent constructive comments on the manuscript. Please find responses to our reviewers' comments as follows:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
There are more important reason causing asthma than anemia like past history of atopy and family history of allergy will not attended in this study.

Response: Thank for your comment. More information are provided in the introduction section. Paragraph 2. Please also see the limitation section.

Reviewer 2:
1. The present study examined 110 or 55 children aged 3 to 12 with asthma?

Response: The study was performed on 110 participants, 55 (50%)were assessed in the case group and 55 in the control group. The main body are revised.
2. Reported information about sample size calculation are not enough.

Response: Thanks for your constructive comment. Required information are implemented. Methos section,-Study design-s sampling.

3. Hb<11 for the ages 4–6 years, <11.5 g/dL for the ages 5–11?

Response: Thank you for your constructive comment. The cut of was corrected in accordance with the standard protocols. https://www.healthline.com/health/normal-hemoglobin-levels#normal-ranges . Revision are made in the method section.

4. Merge Tables 3 and 4.

Response: thank you for your comment. Tables 3 and 4 are merged to one table (table 3).
5. Remove Table 5 and all the related information.

Response: Thank you. It was implemented (table 5 was removed).

6. Report whole the results of regression model in a Table. How about variable selection technique?

Response: Thank you for your nice and constructive comment. Please see table 4 and the Method section - Statistical analysis section.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Thank you for inviting me as an AE of the manuscript entitled "Breastfeeding, Serum level of Hemoglobin and Ferritin Associated with the Risk of Asthma in Children: A Case–Control Study".
THis manuscript does not consider main confounder including socio-economic status of the family, family history of allergy in the family, and history of respiratory tract infection in the early childhood. If the authors have these information, the manuscript could be reanalysis while considering the mentioned confounders.

Response: Thank you for your comment. Additional information are provided and the results are revised according to the reviewer suggestions. Please also see the limitation section.

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) — 20 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
Reported information about sample size calculation is not enough. Mean± SD of groups?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 11 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The important factor such as atopy don't contribute to this study and the author says hasent any information about this subject.
Without this information the study has significant bias.
Thanks.

Najmeh Maharlouei: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 15 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewers' opinion the manuscript still needs some revision. In fact the respected authors should mention some information regarding some major confounders including history of atopy. Also, it seems interesting to the readers to be informed about the detailed characteristics of the participants.
Kindest Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 16 Dec 2019

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 (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.

Ref: 92718.R2
Dear Editor of *Shiraz E-Medical Journal*

Thank you for the recent constructive comments on the manuscript. Please find responses to our reviewers' comments as follows:

Reviewers' Comments:

Public Comments:
The important factor such as atopy don't contribute in this study and author says hasent any information about this subject. Without this information the study may has significant bias.

Response: We highly appreciate your comment. More information is provided in the introduction section. Paragraph 2. Please also see the limitation section.! …. Data on past history of atopy in the early childhood were not available which should be considered as limitation of this study.
Please note that atopy may not significantly alter our finding; please see the following articles which has been published in the prestigious journals: doi.org/10.1111/j.1398-9995.2009.02105.x, doi.org/10.4168/aair.2016.8.2.92, doi.org/10.1111/cea.12439, doi.org/10.1186/s12890-016-0172-x.

Public Comments:
Reported information about sample size calculation are not enough. Mean± SD of groups?

Response: Thank you for your comment. We used odds ratio of a risk factor using formula in case-control studies with OR, Case/Control ratio, a=0.05, and power=80%. More information is provided in the Method section, -Study design-s sampling.

Thank you.
MD

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 3 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.