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.95065
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(6); e95065

Peer Review Report for "Maternal and Neonatal Outcomes in Mothers Using Opioids"

Author(s): Katayoun Salehi, Zohreh Mahmoodi, Kourosh Kabir, Alireza Jashni Motlagh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Jun 2019
Revised Date: 6 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 11 Sep 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) — 18 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Independent T-test is true.
2. Univariate analyses are not enough. Use regression modeling for the main outcomes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Aug 2019

Dear AE
Thanks for your email dated 25.3.98 and apologies for the delayed response.
As mentioned in your request, the article was reviewed and my opinion is as below:
No plagiarism detected. Most topics of the article including; title and abstract, introduction, methods, and discussion have been used properly in relation to the article but it is better to consider a flow diagram and report numbers of individuals before and after the exam for eligibility in results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 10 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
Thank you for inviting me as the SE of this manuscript. It provides the readers good documents regarding maternal and neonatal outcomes in mothers who had used opioids. However, it would become more comprehensive if the authors use regression modeling as well as using a flow diagram that shows details about the number of participants
Kindest Regards

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

Dear editor thanks you for your respect reviewer comments. We did as follow and showed it by red line.

Reviewer 1:
1. Independent T-test is true.
2. Univariate analysis is not enough. Use regression modeling for the main outcomes.

Answer:

1-yes is true because we compare mean in two groups

2- tanks for your comment we did as your comment between variables that were significant effect in table3

Reviewer 2:
Dear AE
Thanks for your email dated 25.3.98 and apologies for delayed response
As mentioned in your request, the article was reviewed and my opinion is as below:
No plagiarism detected. Most topics of the article including; title and abstract, introduction, methods and discussion have been used properly in relation to the article but it is better to consider a flow diagram and report numbers of individuals before and after exam for eligibility in results

Answer:

Thanks for comment but we didn't do any exam. they are two groups that we compare it: addicted and non-addicted mother

I hope I could do everything that you ask.

Regard

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)** 11 Sep 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.