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.109915
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 9(4); e109915

Peer Review Report for "Cardiac Manifestations of Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children (MIS-C) Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection"

Author(s): Alireza Ghodsi, Elnaz Mahmoudabadi, Sara Ghahremani, Abdolreza Malek

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 24 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 28 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,
Please the authors report the search method for case series and case report studies
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 19 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable manuscript. I have no comment.
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript" Cardiac manifestations of multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children (MIS-C) associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection" is an interesting topic.
The main problem of this review is the methodology that was not defined well, Search

strategy and selection criteria, Data source, Data collection and risk of bias assessment, and data analysis method must be defined.
Thanks.

Fariba Alaei: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- The manuscript needs a grammatical edition. Based on multiple reports and multiple source information, what is the novelty of your review?
Introduction
- It seems the common misconception was that the pediatric population were not become symptomatic or not immune at all.
Cardiac involvement
- Cardiac dysfunction is milder than previously thought as more MIS-C cases are defined. Please define this important presentation with more details.
Management
- Again, options are not well and appropriately defined.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Dec 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) 9 Dec 2020

Dear author,
My decision about this manuscript (major revision).
Please follow the reviewer's comments and revise it.
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.

Manuscript #109915

Response to Reviewers

Dear Dr. Tabatabaei,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript "**Cardiac manifestations of multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children (MIS-C) associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection"** for publication in the *Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases*. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript, and we are grateful for the insightful comments which will bring very valuable improvements. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted in the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Reviewers' Comments to the Authors:

Reviewer 1

Thanks for your valuable manuscript. I have no comment.

Author response:

Thanks for your time and contribution.

Reviewer 2

The manuscript" Cardiac manifestations of multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children (MIS-C) associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection" is an interesting topic. The main problem of this review is the methodology that was not defined well, Search strategy and selection criteria, Data source, Data collection and risk of bias assessment, and data analysis method must be defined.

Author response:

We appreciate your helpful advice. We added some paragraphs covering the full methodology that we used in order to conduct the search, to include and extract relevant studies. Moreover, we used a checklist, as named and highlighted in the manuscript, for the appraisal of the studies, and those with high quality were added. We believe that with this major revision according to your advice, the review article is now more precise.

Reviewer 3

General: The manuscript needs grammatical edition. Based on multiple reports and multiple source information, what is the novelty of your review?

Introduction: It seems the common misconception was that the pediatric population were not become symptomatic not immune at all.

Cardiac involvement: Cardiac dysfunction is milder than previously thought as more MIS-C cases are defined. Please define this important presentation with more details.

Management: Again, options are not well and appropriately defined.

Author response:

Thank you for your very valuable comments, and we really appreciate that.

1. The manuscript was revised by a native English speaker to resolve all grammatical and language problems.

2. To define the novelty of our study and the gap of knowledge that we tried to resolve, we added a part to the introduction to mainly describe the novelty of our study. In fact, there are several case reports and case series all around the word that discussed the cardiac involvement due to MIS-C; however, these reports cannot provide evidence to prove their applicability in the clinical diagnosis and management of the MIS-C. Therefore, we tried to gather all these results and draw a conclusion that not only contributes to the literature, but also makes taking clinical decisions easier.

3. In the introduction part, we defined and made it clear that children can be affected by COVID-19; however, as they are usually asymptomatic, there was a misconception that they are not affected by this infection. The hypothesis was somehow wrong as discussed in the introduction.

4. We defined and highlighted the epidemiology of cardiac involvement from the first reports to the newly published reports to clarify the cardiac involvement part, as you mentioned.

5. Several paragraphs were also added to the management part, to provide further details about the management of MIS-C patients.

Best regards and thanks for your advice and comments.

Associate Editor 1:

Dear author

Please report your search method for case series and case report studies

Regards

Author response:

Dear Associate Editor 1:

We added the full methodology of our study and highlighted those modified parts.

Best regards

Associate Editor 2:

Dear authors

Please follow the reviewer's comments and reply in a point-by-point manner. Please highlight new changes in the manuscript.

Thanks

Author response:

Dear Associate Editor 2:

We revised the whole manuscript point by point and highlighted all the changes. Moreover, a native English speaker checked the manuscript.

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) 16 Dec 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) 20 Dec 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.

Manuscript #109915

Response to Reviewers

Dear Dr. Tabatabaei,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript "**Cardiac manifestations of multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children (MIS-C) associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection"** for publication in the *Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases*. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript, and we are grateful for the insightful comments which will bring very valuable improvements. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted in the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Reviewers' Comments to the Authors:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear authors

The overall presentation of the manuscript improved after amendments; however, still, some comments should be taken into consideration in the new submission.

Thanks

First, the abstract should be structured.

Second, it seems that Figure 1 is not original, so, declare originality.

Yours

Author response:

Dear Associate Editor 1:

We added a structured abstract to the manuscript. Also, we changed Figure 1 and declare that the new Figure is original.

We appreciate your helpful advice.

Best 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.

Ali Amanati: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 27 Dec 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** (2) 28 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.