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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/pedinfect.108769
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 9(2); e108769

Peer Review Report for "Vertical Transmission of COVID-19: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Tahereh Fathi Najafi, Sareh Dashti, Narjes Bahri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 31 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 2 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 5 Dec 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) — 13 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Totally :
This is a comprehensive study with a good design and evidence collection, but the format of the review article is different based on journal guidelines. (the discussion part does not exist in guideline format) and the other parts can be modified.
Abbreviations can be placed in the text.
Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
1- The reasons for excluding the studies are not mentioned.
2- The application of quality evaluation of articles in this systematic review is not clear. In this article, neither the role of quality evaluation in determining the inclusion and exclusion criteria of studies nor its role in analyzing the results of articles is mentioned. Also, reporting the results of cohort and case control studies alongside case report articles indicates that the quality of the articles has no role in the final results.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Regarding the recent COVID-19 pandemic, this article can give us new information.
Based on our review it needs minor revision.
Please arrange it according to the journal format.
Best regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 17 Nov 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:

Thank you for submission of this article

Totally :

This is a comprehensive study with a good design and evidence collection, but the format of review article is different based on journal guidelines (the discussion part does not exist in guideline format) and the other parts can be modified.

The titles and subtitles were corrected based on journal guidelines.

Abbreviations can be placed in the text.

The abbreviations were first described in full first time they appeared in text.

Best regards

Reviewer 2:

Dear author

1- The reasons for excluding the studies are not mentioned.

Only studies with low quality were excluded. The phrase was added to the inclusion and exclusion criteria section.

2- The application of quality evaluation of articles in this systematic review is not clear. In this article, neither the role of quality evaluation in determining the inclusion and exclusion criteria of studies, nor its role in analyzing the results of articles is mentioned. Also, reporting the results of cohort and case control studies alongside case report articles indicates that the quality of the articles has no role in the final results.

Due to the importance of the subjects all types of studies were included in the review. Only studies with low quality were excluded.

Results of case reports and case series were reported in a separate table.

Regards

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) 29 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
It is not clear what the authors mean by low-quality articles and why they are excluded. What exactly is the role of evaluating the quality of articles in this review study?
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Nov 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) 1 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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 Editorial Board of the Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases

Thank you for putting effort in reviewing the submitted manuscript. The response to the reviewer is presented below. The changes in the manuscript is highlighted in the submitted revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

Dear author

It is not clear what you mean by low quality articles and why they are excluded. What exactly is the role of evaluating the quality of articles in this review study?

The reason for quality assessment was stated in the text (highlighted in yellow). Some institutions suggest the use of quality assessment tools in the critical appraisal of all types of systematic reviews and downplay the validity of the usual process of minimum criteria for inclusion. Therefore, due to the sensitivity of the objective of this study and the existence of low quality and unreliable data, the authors used a valid quality assessment tool to exclude unreliable and biased articles.

Regards,

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 4 Dec 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 5 Dec 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.