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.98627
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(10); e98627

Peer Review Report for "Is it Necessary to Recommend Iodine Supplement to Pregnant Women Living in Areas with Adequate Iodine Intake?"

Author(s): Mahmood Sovid, Maryam Bahmani, Alamtaj Aamsami

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 29 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 18 Mar 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) 31 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
This case-control study on iodine status of 298 pregnant women showed that iodine supplementation during pregnancy is still mandatory in iodine-replete areas like our country.
My suggestions:
In “Abstract”:
1- “Results: Mean UIC in groups 1 was 175.71 ±56.43µg/L and it was in the recommended range of 150-250µg/L.” The last sentence must be transfer to “Background”.
2- Results, line 4: change UAC to UIC.
3- “Conclusion: In areas with iodine sufficiency in general population, it is necessary to recommend iodine supplement to pregnant women to prevent iodine insufficiency.” The first sentence is better to change as: In areas with national salt iodine implementation program” or “In areas with salt iodination program”.
In “Background”:
4- “The aim of this research is to compare UIC of pregnant women taking iodine supplementation with those not taking it.” This subject doesn’t need study for confirmation. It is obvious that the UIC in pregnant women who taking iodine supplementation will be higher than those not taking it. So, I recommend revising the aim of the study and rewriting according to the title of the manuscript in a separate and last paragraph of the

“Background”; e.g.“The aim of this research is to evaluate the necessity for iodine supplementation in pregnant women living in …… , an iodine replete area.”
5- Last line: “UIC is an accepted indicator of recent iodine status of the population (12).” I recommend transferring this sentence to 2nd paragraph of the “Background”.
In “Materials and Methods”:
6- The calculated sample size for each group (case and control) is not mentioned in the manuscript.
7- Line 10: If the research was a case-control study, it is mandatory to mention it in the “Abstract” and first lines of the “Materials and Methods”.
In “Results”:
8- It is better to mention the mean of the baseline UIC (before pregnancy), as many healthy women use iodofolic tablet before conception and continue it during pregnancy. If the data is not available, I recommend to state it in the limitations of the study.
In “Discussion”:
9- State the strengths and limitations of your study.
In “Conclusions”:
10- “Our study supports recommending iodine supplement to pregnant women living in areas where general population is iodine sufficient.” Should be revised according to the above suggestion (number 3)
Thanks.

Mohammad Hossein Dabbaghmanesh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Feb 2020

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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 Feb 2020

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

Dear editor:

With regard to reviewers comments on manuscript 98627 the following responses are provided. Changes in the manuscript are shown in red color.

Reviewer 1:
This case-control study on iodine status of 298 pregnant women showed that iodine supplementation during pregnancy is still mandatory in iodine-replete areas like our country.
My suggestions:
In "Abstract":
1- "Results: Mean UIC in groups 1 was 175.71 ±56.43µg/L and it was in the recommended range of 150-250µg/L." The last sentence must be transfer to "Background".

It is transferred to line 37 in abstract background.

2- Results, line 4: change UAC to UIC.

It is changed, line 52 in abstract result

3- "Conclusion: In areas with iodine sufficiency in general population, it is necessary to recommend iodine supplement to pregnant women to prevent iodine insufficiency." The first sentence is better to change as: In areas with national salt iodine implementation program" or "In areas with salt iodination program".

It is changed, line 57 in abstract conclusion.

In "Background":
4- "The aim of this research is to compare UIC of pregnant women taking iodine supplementation with those not taking it." This subject doesn't need study for confirmation. It is obvious that the UIC in pregnant women who taking iodine supplementation will be higher than those not taking it. So, I recommend revising the aim of the study and rewriting according to the title of the manuscript in a separate and last paragraph of the "Background"; e.g."The aim of this research is to evaluate the necessity for iodine supplementation in pregnant women living in …..… , an iodine replete area."

It is changed :lines 87-88 in background.

5- Last line: "UIC is an accepted indicator of recent iodine status of the population (12)." I recommend transferring this sentence to 2nd paragraph of the "Background".

It is transferred to lines 78-80 in background.

In "Materials and Methods":
6- The calculated sample size for each group (case and control) is not mentioned in the manuscript.

It is mentioned in Line 98 in materials and method

7- Line 10: If the research was a case-control study, it is mandatory to mention it in the "Abstract" and first lines of the "Materials and Methods".

It is mentioned in abstract line 43 in material and method , and in line 91 in materials and method of main manuscript.

In "Results":
8- It is better to mention the mean of the baseline UIC (before pregnancy), as many healthy women use iodofolic tablet before conception and continue it during pregnancy. If the data is not available, I recommend to state it in the limitations of the study.

The initial data was not available and it is mentioned as limitation of our study in discussion lines 186-187(last paragraph).

In "Discussion":
9- State the strengths and limitations of your study.

It is stated at the end of discussion in lines 186-190.

In "Conclusions":
10- "Our study supports recommending iodine supplement to pregnant women living in areas where general population is iodine sufficient." Should be revised according to the above suggestion (number 3)

It is revised in lines 197-198 in conclusion.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear editor in chief
The manuscript as "Is it necessary to recommend iodine supplement to pregnant women living in areas with adequate iodine intake? "were reviewed by reviewers. The authors presented a case-

control study on iodine status of pregnant women that has been suggested, iodine supplementation during pregnancy is necessary in iodine sufficient area.
Reviewer 1
One of the most important aspects of this work is determination of iodine nutrition of vulnerable individuals, pregnant women, however we have some published data and review with the same recommendation and suggestions in this regard in Iranian pregnant women such as this published article as:
Delshad H, Azizi F. Review of Iodine Nutrition in Iranian Population in the Past Quarter of Century Int J Endocrinol Metab. 2017 Oct 28;15(4):e57758.
Please determine novelty in your study by comparing it with the work that was done by others and pointing out the things that your study does which was never done before and mention it in introduction and discuss it in your work.

The main purpose of our study was not determination of iodine status of study population. Our main purpose was to investigate the need for iodine supplementation in pregnancy which was never done in previous Iranian studies. The other aspect our study showed the effectiveness of domestically produced formulation of iodide (iodofolic).These are added in limitation and strength section at the end of discussion(lines 186-190 in discussion). We have pointed to 7 previous studies in Iran (lines 145 to 153 in discussion) including the paper by Delshad &Azizi .It is reference 8 of our manuscript. Other Iranian studies are our references No 9,10,11,14,15,22 .Their results are compared with ours in lines 163-164 of discussion. As stated previously all of these studies have only investigated the prevalence of iodine insufficiency during pregnancy which was not the main aim our study. .
Reviewer 2
This case-control study on iodine status of 298 pregnant women showed that iodine supplementation during pregnancy is still mandatory in iodine-replete areas like our country.
My suggestions:
In "Abstract":
1- "Results: Mean UIC in groups 1 was 175.71 ±56.43µg/L and it was in the recommended range of 150-250µg/L." The last sentence must be transfer to "Background".

It is transferred,to line 37 in abstract background.

2- Results, line 4: change UAC to UIC.

It is changed, line 52 in abstract result

3- "Conclusion: In areas with iodine sufficiency in general population, it is necessary to recommend iodine supplement to pregnant women to prevent iodine insufficiency." The first sentence is better to change as: In areas with national salt iodine implementation program" or "In areas with salt iodination program".

It is changed, line 57 of abstract conclusion.

In "Background":
4- "The aim of this research is to compare UIC of pregnant women taking iodine supplementation with those not taking it." This subject doesn't need study for confirmation. It is obvious that the UIC in pregnant women who taking iodine supplementation will be higher than those not taking it. So, I recommend revising the aim of the study and rewriting according to the title of the manuscript in a separate and last paragraph of the "Background"; e.g."The aim of this research is to evaluate the necessity for iodine supplementation in pregnant women living in …… , an iodine replete area."

It is changed :lines 87-88 in background.

5- Last line: "UIC is an accepted indicator of recent iodine status of the population (12)." I recommend transferring this sentence to 2nd paragraph of the "Background".

It is transferred to lines 78-80 in background.

In "Materials and Methods":
6- The calculated sample size for each group (case and control) is not mentioned in the manuscript.

It is mentioned in Line 98 of materials and method.

7- Line 10: If the research was a case-control study, it is mandatory to mention it in the "Abstract" and first lines of the "Materials and Methods".

It is mentioned in abstract line 43 in material and method , and in line 91 in materials and method of main manuscript.

In "Results":
8- It is better to mention the mean of the baseline UIC (before pregnancy), as many healthy women use iodofolic tablet before conception and continue it during pregnancy. If the data is not available, I recommend to state it in the limitations of the study.

The baseline data was not available and it is mentioned as limitation of our study in discussion lines 186-187(last paragraph).

In "Discussion":
9- State the strengths and limitations of your study.

It is stated at the end of discussion in lines 186-190.

In "Conclusions":
10- "Our study supports recommending iodine supplement to pregnant women living in areas where general population is iodine sufficient." Should be revised according to the above suggestion (number 3)

It is revised in lines 197-198 of conclusion.

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.

Mesbah Shams: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 11 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The article is appropriately revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
This study examines " Is it necessary to recommend iodine supplement to pregnant women living in areas with adequate iodine intake?". According to reviewers' comments, the authors have made major revisions and tried the best to improve their manuscript. It can be meet with your approval for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Mar 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.