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.108582
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 9(2); e108582

Peer Review Report for "Transplacental Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Case Report from Iran"

Author(s): Farhad Abolhasan Choobdar, Maral Ghassemzadeh, Mohammad Attarian, Ezzat Abbariki, Alireza Nateghian, Behrooz Ghanbari, Samira Shah Hamzehi, Melika Razavi Hashemi, Zahra Azarbin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 29 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 5 Nov 2020

Revision (0)

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

Ali Naseh: Reviewer | Revision (0) 26 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this case report. This case represents a premature baby born to a mother who had been diagnosed with acute myeloid leukemia (AML Non-M3) and both the mother and her newborn were positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection. Since RT-PCR of placental tissue on the fetal side was positive for the SARS-CoV-2 gene, the authors reasoned that this is a case of transplacental transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection. In general, the paper is well written but needs to be revised by the authors for English language and punctuation. The Discussion part is a bit long. Rather than explaining the details of two other case reports, it is better to write about the relationship between those two cases and this case including similarities or differences. Language examples for corrections needed include:
- Line 2 Abstract: one of the most…

- Line 3 Abstract: route
- Line 7 Abstract: Please delete the space between the punctuation and the word before it. Punctuations should be coherent throughout the paper and there should be no space between the punctuation and the word before it.
- On line 14 the references are put after the period while the following reference numbers are put before the period. Please keep coherence in writing.
- The first time you use an acronym please put the complete words and then add their acronyms in parenthesis and then you can use that acronym later throughout the rest of your paper. For example, put “acute myeloid leukemia” rather than AML Non-M3 and also “necrotizing enterocolitis” rather than NEC the first time you use them in your text.
- On line 30, please replace it with May 13.
- Line 37: Please spell out the words “bone marrow aspiration” rather than “BMA/BX”
- Line 53: Please use “arterial blood gas” the first time you use “ABG”.
- Line 55: on July 6
- Line 60: The following sentences need to be placed earlier within the text to keep the text’s sequence or chronicle correct: “After general anesthesia, she underwent cesarean section,…”.
- Line 90: Please use “retinopathy of prematurity” rather than “ROP”.
- Please keep coherence in formatting the Reference list. All references should have the same format.

Thanks.

Naeeme Taslimi Taleghani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Sep 2020

Dear AE

Thanks for this valuable case report. This is an interesting paper. However, it needs to be slightly modified. I have some recommendations for the authors:

1- Edit to correct some words. ("route", not "rout" line 3.)

2- The word at the beginning of the sentence must start with the capital letter.(line 142,159,165,…)

3- Correct improper dot in the middle of some sentences(line 156)

4- Some sentences need to be displaced to maintain concept coherence. (line 60-62)

5- Abbreviations should be written first time in the complete word.(AML,NEC,BMA/BX…)

6- Table 1 is vaguely designed.

a. Column titles must be determinate.

b. The mentioned numbers (1-4) should be described in table subtitle.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Sep 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 minor revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 17 Sep 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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear authors

Thanks for this valuable case report. This is an interesting paper. However, it needs to be slightly modified. I have some recommendations for you:

1- Edit to correct some words. ("route", not "rout" line 3.)
That was corrected.
2- The word at the beginning of the sentence must start with the capital letter.(line 142,159,165,...)

Those mistakes were all corrected.

3- Correct improper dot in the middle of some sentences(line 156)

That was corrected.

4- Some sentences need to be displaced to maintain concept coherence. (line 60-62)
Those sentences were displaced.
5- Abbreviations should be written first time in the complete word.(AML,NEC,BMA/BX...)

Those mistakes were all corrected.

6- Table 1 is vaguely designed.

I just fixed the problem.

a. Column titles must be determinate.

I just tried to make it more clear, the first column is PCR results and the second one is serologic findings as it is mentioned in the table.

b. The mentioned numbers (1-4) should be described in table subtitle.

I did it as you mentioned.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for submitting your case report. Your case represents a premature baby born to a mother who had been diagnosed with acute myeloid leukemia (AML Non M3) and both the mother and her newborn were positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection. Since RT-PCR of placental tissue fetal side was positive for SARS-CoV-2 gene, you reasoned that this is a case of transplacental transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection. In general, paper is well written but needs to be revised for English language and punctuations. The Discussion part is a bit long. Rather than explaining the details of two other case reports, it is better to write about the relation between those two cases and your case including similarities or differences. Language examples for corrections needed include:

Line 2 Abstract: one of the most...

It is corrected.

Line 3 Abstract: route

It is corrected.

Line 7 Abstract: Please delete space between punctuation and the word before it. Punctuations should be coherent throughout the paper and there should be no space between the punctuation and the word before it.

It is corrected.

On line 14 the references are put after the period while the following reference numbers are put before the period. Please keep coherence in writing.

It is corrected.

The first time you use an acronym please put the complete words and then add their acronyms in parenthesis and then you can use that acronym later throughout the rest of your paper. For example, put “acute myeloid leukemia” rather than AML Non M3 and also “necrotizing enterocolitis” rather than NEC the first time you use them in your text.

It is corrected.

On line 30, please replace in with on May 13.

It is corrected.

Line 37: Please spell out the words “bone marrow aspiration” rather than “BMA/BX”

It is corrected.

Line 53: Please use “arterial blood gas” the first time you use “ABG”.

It is corrected.

Line 55: on July 6

It is corrected.

Line 60: The following sentences need to be placed earlier within the text to keep the text's sequence or chronicle correct: "After general anesthesia she underwent cesarean section,…".

It is corrected.

Line 90: Please use "retinopathy of prematurity" rather than "ROP".

It is corrected.

Please keep coherence in formatting the Reference list. All references should have the same format.

It is corrected.

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.

Naeeme Taslimi Taleghani: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 1 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable study. This is an interesting paper.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 2 Nov 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 5 Nov 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.