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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/pedinfect.103466
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 8(3); e103466

Peer Review Report for "Reinfection or Relapse in SARS-CoV-2-Infected Patients; Does it Occur?"

Author(s): Abdollah Karimi , Fariba Shirvani, Kimia Seifi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 22 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Apr 2020

Revision (0)

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

Sedigheh Rafiei Tabatabaei: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this valuable letter, there are some comments for the authros:
1- The manuscript should be revised by an English editor of publisher or some one else.
2- Please update this sentence: “There have been 803126 cases and 39032 death in 177 countries up to 31 Mar 2020 from this virus”.
3- What is your finally conclusion and suggestion about Reinfection or relapse? please add some new probable mechanisms up to now.
Overall it is accepted for publication after above requirement.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
I hope the revised manuscript will meet the requirements of all reviewers.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Apr 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 (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 Reviewer:

Thank you for your valuable comments.

I have revised the letter based on your comments

1- I have done it and I sent it to publisher for English edition
2- I updated the sentence.
3- I added the conclusion, and added another mechanism with reference.
Best wishes

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.

Sedigheh Rafiei Tabatabaei-EIC: EIC | **Revision (1)** 23 Apr 2020

Dear author,

I read the revised manuscript.

I have no further comments to add. I thank the authors for their detailed replies to the reviewer's comments on the submitted version.

Regards