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/apid.104860
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 8(4); e104860

Peer Review Report for "SARS Coronavirus 2, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome in Children: A Review on Epidemiology, Clinical Presentation, and Diagnosis"

Author(s): Seyed Ahmad Tabatabaii, Pegah Soltani, Ghamartaj Khanbabaee, Deepak Sharma, Rohollah Valizadeh, Nazanin Farahbakhsh, Marjan Tariverdi, Matin Pourghasem, Ebrahim Tabiei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	12 May 2020
Revised Date:	3 Aug 2020
Accepted Date:	11 Aug 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jun 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 22 Jun 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) 23 Jun 2020

Dear author,
Thank you so much for your contribution to APID.
According to the reviewers' comments, my decision about this manuscript is a major revision.
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 reviewers

thank you for your valuable comments all the requested items has been provided by the authors and the final manuscript has been submitted

Associate Editor 1:
Dear author
Thank you for the manuscript
Associate Editor 2:

The title should be changed:
My suggestion: "SARS coronavirus 2, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome in children, a review on epidemiology, clinical presentation, and diagnosis"

It has changed as requested
Abstract:
The abstract should be structured.

Structured abstract has been submitted
In this part: "The pediatric population usually doesn't present with typical clinical features of infection but has positive", replace "usually doesn't present with typical clinical features of infection" with "maybe asymptomatic".

It has changed as requested
Keywords:
Spell out SARS and MERS
Remove "COVID-19"
Add "SARS coronavirus 2"

It has changed as requested

Replace "context" with "Introduction"

It has changed as requested
Replace: "From December 2019 an epidemic with 2019-nCoV (novel Corona virus) started with a report of a pneumonia with an unknown cause from from Wuhan, Hubei Province, China", with "Since December 2019, an increasing number of unknown viral pneumonia reported from Wuhan, Hubei Province, China"

It has changed as requested
Results
Spell out all abbreviations in the first time used.

It has done as requested
Add more details for this statement: "Rate of infection with COVID-19 among children under 10 years old is the same as the total population average". reconsider update correction ...

It has changed as requested
Update this statement: "The youngest patient confirmed for infection with COVID-192019 is a neonate less than 1 month old which is younger than the youngest age for SARS and MERS, which was 9 and 7 months of age respectively"

It has changed as requested
Add update information regard "Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome Related to COVID-19" in children.

The mentioned item added
Update this part: "Children to adult transmission of COVID-19 is reported in one case which was a 3 months infant whom parents got positive test result after a period of giving care to their i
It has changed as requested *nfant with no protections"*

About this heading "Role of immune system", this part in uninformative, and without a major revision, it is better to remove.

Removed
This part is Unmeaningful: "Increased severity of SARS in patients with decreased viral load was because of the host immune response as a pathway of immunopathogenesis for SARS-cov"

Removed
Conclusion
Conclusion should be shortened and revised
No useful comparison was made between SARS, MERS, and SRAS-CoV-2 in conclusion.

It has changed as requested
Table 1
Remove symbol in reported percent of MILD/ASYMPTOMATIC cases in SARS-CoV-2 infected children and correct it with proper words.
The references of analyzed studies should be mentioned for each entity (SARS, MERS, and SARS-CoV-2)
Add information regard mortality rate and underlying diseases in children to Table 1.
Align data in mid-position in all columns.

The table updated and changed in way to be more practical and *clear*
Thanks

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Jul 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) 25 Jul 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 reviewers thank you for your valuable comments.

In Abstract:
Replace "Context" with "introduction"

Changed
In Abstract, result section:
This is not true results obtained from this review ... revised this section

The section revised as requested

Thank you for your consideration

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) 11 Aug 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.