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.94544
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(5); e94544

Peer Review Report for "Comparison Between Measuring of Lipid Profile in Fasting and Non-Fasting States: A Cross-Sectional Study from Iraq"

Author(s): Noor Talal, Haider Ayad Alidrisi, Abbas Ali Mansour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 May 2019
Revised Date: 28 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 4 Oct 2019

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 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
In this study the lipid profile of 194 patients in fasting and the non-fasting state has been compared through a cross-sectional design, there are some recommendations for improving the manuscript before publication:
1) The manuscript should be revised for English grammatical errors, and paragraph writing.
2) The complete form of all abbreviations including CKD should be figured out.
3) The references numbered 15 and 16 should be rechecked.
4) One of the limitations of the study is the unclear interval between blood sampling and food consumption.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 31 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for sending me this manuscript for review. I have some comment for this manuscript as follow:
Abstract
1. Please tell more details in the method section of the abstract as well as the duration

period of the study, and important inclusion criteria such as age range
2. TG called in the result section of the abstract is an abbreviation form. Please mention the main word for the first time.
3. Please report the standard deviation together with the mean of the variables in the abstract.
4. Please re-write the conclusion of the abstract.
Introduction:
1. Reference 14 in the texts of the abstract came without related texts in the 29th line of the introduction .
2. “In two large studies, non-fasting TG was found to be superior to fasting TG in association with CVD. (15,16)”. Please describe this claim more according to related articles.
3. The flow of the introduction is not suitable. Please arrange this section.
4. The importance of the research was not fully stated in the introduction.
Material and method:
1. What is the “Ref” at the end of the 18th line? I think it is the reference that was missed by the authors.
2. It is better that you gather the definitions of the characteristics in one table.
3. The inclusion criteria were not described clearly.
4. The ETHICS issue of the study was not described.
5. Exclusion criteria: “on medications that cause severe hypertriglyceridemia” please describe clearly. Which medication are the causes of severe hypertriglyceridemia? why you only exclude the patients who used these medications? And it seems that the other types of lipids were missed in this section.
6. For comparison of lipid data between fasting and non-fasting state you should use a paired t-test, not a student t-test because you have only one group.
7. Why you did not exclude the diabetic patients for having a homogenous sample.
Result:
1. Please don’t repeat the whole of the tables in result texts.
2. It is better if their text of the result lessens.
Discussion:
1. The conclusion does not strongly support the result.
2. It is non –academic that insert the references at the end of the paragraph only and Finally.
3. The article has a statistical problem.
4. In addition, the manuscript needs English editing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs a major revision.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 3 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs a major 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.

Reviewer 1

Abstract

1. Method revision was addressed and highlighted
2. Although TG was mentioned first in main word, we added the abbreviation immediately after it, and highlighted.
3. The standard deviation was added in the result section.
4. Conclusion was re-written.

Introduction

Revisions were done and highlighted and ref 14 was removed.

Materials and method

Two references was added and highlighted for definition of DM and HTN

Inclusion criteria was already mentioned, *out-patients attending Faiha Specialized Diabetes, Endocrine and Metabolism Center (FDEMC) and Basrah General Hospital for routine checkup.*

The ethical committee was described and highlighted.

The lists of drugs affecting TG were mentioned and highlighted.

We did not exclude diabetic patients in order test them. Why to exclude commonly encountered patients in clinical practice?

Reviewer 2

References were checked,

CKD was added in immediately after the first main word

For sure the unclear interval between food consumption and non-fasting blood sampling may affect the results. For this reason, was added as a limitation.

Grammar was reviewed and any change was highlighted.

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.

Kamran Bagheri Lankarani: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Oct 2019

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