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.109843
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 9(4); e109843

Peer Review Report for "Association of COVID-19 Infection and Purpura Fulminans"

Author(s): Anahita Sanaei Dashti, Seyed Sina Dehghani, Hossein Moravej, Seyyedeh Narjes Abootalebi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Sep 2020
Revised Date: 25 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 1 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 11 Oct 2020

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

Seyed Alireza Fahimzad: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Was there any exposure in her family with covid positive patients?
2- Was there any cardiac involvement in her echocardiography?
3- What is your differential diagnosis for your patients and what are your reasons that this patient didn't have an MIS-C diagnosis?
Thanks a lot

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Nov 2020

Dear AE,

1- As this case is not novel now, please mention the date of visiting the patient especially for this sentence"To the best of our knowledge, up till now, no published COVID-19 case with PF is presented in literature and this appears to be the first reported case of COVID-19 and PF."

2- Please discuss more about covid presentation with PF and differential diagnosis

Bests

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Nov 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) 8 Nov 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 (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 respects

The following response to the reviewers:

Reviewer 1:

Thanks for your valuable comments

1. No, the patient had no known exposure, but on that time we were at the peak of outbreak. Indeed, many of children patients had no clear history of exposure to confirmed COVID-19 patients.
2. The patient had undergone echocardiography, which revealed mild dilated left ventricle and good biventricular function.
3. The patient was in acute phase of the disease due to her positive PCR test. MIS-C usually occurs a while after onset of COVID-19, so the PCR test in this situation is usually negative. Furthermore, one of the symptoms of this disease include rash but extremity vasculitis was not mentioned for it.

Best Regards

Reviewer 2:

Thanks for your valuable comments

1. As you said we added the date of visiting of the patient before the mentioned sentence.
2. We discuss more about COVID-19 presentation with purpura fulminans in the discussion part of case report.

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

Dear EIC,
I read the revised manuscript
I have no further comments to add. I thank the authors for their very detailed replies to my comments.
Regards.

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