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.109981
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 10(Suppl); e109981

Peer Review Report for "Ocular Complication of a Child with Confirmed 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease: A Case Report"

Author(s): Anahita Sanaei Dashti, Zahra Mehdipour Namdar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 15 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 23 Jan 2021

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) — 10 Oct 2020

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

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

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Abstraction:Conclusion: Our findings suggest that the COVID-19 virus can transmit through tears and conjunctiva secretions in children as adults.....by this study authors couldn't show transmission through tear ,only they can say about the presence of a virus in eye secretion
- Line 58- what does it mean,relatively well?
- Line 63-The temperature 38 and the respiratory rate were 38 and 50 respectively. what does it mean?

- Please mention was it purulent conjunctivitis or not?
- Line 99-Our findings suggest that COVID-19 .....it better say: our finding show virus present in tear so it can be a source for transmission
- Lines 101 and 102 are not your result.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

3 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,

Please the authors follow the reviewer's comments and reply in a point-by-point manner.

Please highlight new changes in the manuscript.

English copy-editing warranted before the next submission.

Thanks

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

6 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 (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 reviewer 1,

Thanks for your valuable comments:

1-abstraction:Conclusion: Our findings suggest that COVID-19 virus can transmit through tears and conjunctiva secretions in children as adults.....by this study authors couldn't show transmission through tear ,only they can say about presence of virus on eye secretion

The sentence was changed

2-line 58- what dose it mean ,relatively well:

Actually the patient was well, that was edited.

3-line 63-The temperature 38 and the respiratory rate were 38 and 50 respectively. what dose it mean:

Sentence structure was edited.

4-please mention was it a purulent conjunctivitis or not?

Conjunctivitis was not purulent

5-line 99-Our findings suggest that COVID-19 .....it better say: our finding show virus present in tear so it can be a source for transmission :

That was edited

6-line 101 and 102 are not your result:

We omitted the sentences.

With best regrads

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) 26 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) 28 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 reviewer 1,

Thanks for your valuable comments:

1-abstraction:Conclusion: Our findings suggest that COVID-19 virus can transmit through tears and conjunctiva secretions in children as adults.....by this study authors couldn't show transmission through tear ,only they can say about presence of virus on eye secretion

The sentence was changed

2-line 58- what dose it mean ,relatively well:

Actually the patient was well, that was edited.

3-line 63-The temperature 38 and the respiratory rate were 38 and 50 respectively. what dose it mean:

Sentence structure was edited.

4-please mention was it a purulent conjunctivitis or not?

Conjunctivitis was not purulent

5-line 99-Our findings suggest that COVID-19 .....it better say: our finding show virus present in tear so it can be a source for transmission :

That was edited

6-line 101 and 102 are not your result:

We omitted the sentences.

7- The picture of patient was added.

With best regrads

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) 20 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
I have no further comments to add. I thank the authors for their very detailed reply to my comments on the submitted version.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 23 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.