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.95872
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(1); e95872

Peer Review Report for "The Frequency of Genetic Alleles of Alpha-1 Antitrypsin in Infants and Children with the Cholestatic Idiopathic Hepatic Disease in Khorasan Razavi- Iran"

Author(s): Saeedeh Vahedi, Sara Gholami, Hamidreza Kianifar, Tayebeh Hamzehloei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 27 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 30 Oct 2020

Revision (0)

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

Maryam Ataollahi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs major revision to be accepted.
with best regards.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 28 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks for choosing me as e peer reviwer
- The title is not proper because the study was done on 30 neonates but it is mentioned as infants and children with liver disease in the title.
- The abstract is structured, but the background paragraph has 1 misspelling in 1st line (word instead of world) and grammar mistake in last 2 lines, also the words “idiopathic” and “jaundice” is repeated improperly.
- It is better that idiopathic neonatal jaundice disease be changed to neonatal cholestasis.
- Neonatal jaundice is mentioned several times in the abstract, but this term is not reflected the target population that is evaluated in this study.

- The selection of patients is not clarified properly, the other investigations that were done to exclude other causes of neonatal cholestasis are not mentioned, if liver biopsies were done or not: whether biopsies were in favor of A1ATD or not. The “subject” paragraph is very short and not representative of patients. Sample size calculation is not provided. Demographic data and other characteristics of patients are not described.
- What is the necessity for control subject in this study?
- In the 1st line of the result, it is mentioned that 30 patients with prolonged jaundice were selected, if they have cholestasis or not?
- The volume of blood and tube is not mentioned.
- Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria dose not be explained.
- Statistical Analysis dose not be explained.
- Ethical Considerations is not mentioned.
- The TABLES AND FIGURES are not enough.
- The methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data are not described.
- Discussion paragraph is omitted and only conclusion is mentioned.

Final Conclusion: Major Revision

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 29 Nov 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 Dr. **Kamran Bagheri Lankarani**

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the experiments that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Sincerely,

Tayebeh Hamzehloei, Ph.D.Assisstant professor of Humam genetics

We appreciate that the reviewer's comments. The followings are our point-by-point responses:

1- The title is not proper because the study was done on 30 neonates but it is mentioned as infant and children with liver disease in the title:

Re: We have changed "infant and children" to "neonates" (highlighted in the text).

2- The abstract is structured, but the background paragraph has 1 misspelling in 1st line (word instead of world) and grammar mistake in last 2 lines, also the words "idiopathic" and "jaundice" is repeated improperly.

Re: We have corrected the mistakes (highlighted in the text).

3- It is better that idiopathic neonatal jaundice disease be changed to neonatal cholestasis.

Re: As suggested by the reviewer, we have changed "idiopathic neonatal jaundice" to "neonatal cholestasis" (highlighted in the text).

4- Neonatal jaundice is mentioned several times in the abstract, but this term is not reflected the target population that is evaluated in this study.

Re: As suggested by the reviewer, we have changed “neonatal jaundice” to “neonatal cholestasis” (highlighted in the text).

5- The selection of patients is not clarified properly, the other investigations that were done to exclude other causes of neonatal cholestasis are not mentioned

Re: We have added selection criteria. The known and relevant metabolic, autoimmune diseases, infections, and anatomic disorders were excluded. It was based on their medical records(added in “subject” part).

6- If liver biopsies were done or not: whether biopsies were in favor of A1ATD or not.

Re: No. we had just blood samples.

7- The “subject” paragraph is very short and not representative of patients.

Re: We agreed with the reviewer and added some information about patients in “subject” paragraph.

8- Sample size calculation is not provided.

Re: The sample size was based on literature review

9- Demographic data and other characteristics of patients are not described.

Re: We added Demographic features of patients in Table 1.

10- What is the necessity for control subject in this study?

Re: The control group was used for evaluating mutant allele in healthy individuals.

11- In the 1st line of result, it is mentioned that 30 patients with prolonged jaundice was selected, if they have cholestasis or not?
Re: yes, they have cholestasis (highlighted in the “Result” paragraph).

12- The volume of blood and tube is not mentioned.

Re: It was mentioned in “Method” paragraph (highlighted in text).

13- Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria dose not be explained.

Re: The neonates with a clinical diagnosis of cholestatic jaundice were included in this study. The known and relevant metabolic, autoimmune diseases, infections, and anatomic disorders were excluded (added in “subject” paragraph).

14- Statistical Analysis dose not be explained.

Re: We agreed with the reviewer and added “Statistical analysis” part (highlighted in the text).

15- Ethical Considerations is not mentioned.

Re: Ethical Considerations added in “Method” paragraph.

16- The TABLES AND FIGURES is not enough:

Re: As the reviewer suggested we added 3 other tables in the text.

17- The methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data are not described.

Re: We added this in “Statistical analysis” part.

18- Discussion paragraph is omitted and only conclusion is mentioned.

Re: We agreed with the reviewer and added “Discussion” paragraph.

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) 5 Oct 2020

Dear AE,

• I think it's better to add "in" to the title: The frequency of genetic alleles of alpha-1 antitrypsin in neonates with cholestatic idiopathic hepatic disease in khorasan Razavi- Iran.

• 1st line of discussion: the word deficiency should be added: Alpha 1 antitrypsin deficiency.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Oct 2020

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

Kind regards,

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

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.

Dear Dr. **Kamran Bagheri Lankarani**

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the experiments that the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Sincerely,

Dr Tayebeh Hamzehloei

-We appreciate that the reviewer's comments. The followings are our point-by-point responses:

Q1: I think it's better to add "in" to the title: The frequency of genetic alleles of alpha-1 antitrypsin in neonates with cholestatic idiopathic hepatic disease in Khorasan Razavi-Iran.

Re: As suggested by the reviewer, we added word "in" to the title (highlighted in the text).

Q2: 1st line of discussion: the word deficiency should be added: Alpha 1 antitrypsin deficiency.

Re: As suggested by the reviewer, we added word "deficiency" in the first line of "Discussion" (highlighted in the text).

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) 30 Oct 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.