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.94371
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 8(1); e94371

Peer Review Report for "Epstein Barr Virus-associated Pediatric Neoplasms"

Author(s): Mozhgan Hashemieh , Fariba Shirvani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 May 2019
Revised Date: 22 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Jan 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) 19 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
This text has no standard format article. I don't understand if this article is a review article or another type of article?
If this is a systematic review article the authors should express PICO or foreground question and search strategy. This text is a similar collection of some parts of the disease from some references and has no standard format for systematic or narrative review.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 29 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
This paper has a potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified before we can proceed and a positive action can be taken. In my opinion, The content of the article is closer to the book. This review should evaluate the original article about this topic.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks so much for considering me as a reviewer for the manuscript. This manuscript can be acceptable but with some revisions.
- With special thanks for sending a manuscript to be reviewed, the study, entitled," EBV associated pediatric neoplasms"
Ref 94371, is concerned with EBV associated malignancy in pediatrics. This study focused on different types of neoplasm such as Burkitt lymphoma, PTLD, NPC, Hodgkin's lymphoma and HLH. The manuscript is well written but there are some corrections and comments as follows that can enrich the content.
1- There are few spelling mistakes in the text that needs to be corrected
2- It is expected that in the review article more detailed scientific points will be express
3- On page 3, "Introduction", line 10 "disease" may be better replaced with "infection" as well as "replication" at the end of line 14 better substituted with propagation.
4-On page 4, line 4, what's your meaning of (antigen negative)?
5- On page 4, line 8, in some references 4 types of latency have been mentioned; Latency 0, I, II and III.
6- On page 5, HL (the abbreviation of Hodgkin lymphoma) should be written in one format throughout the manuscript.
7- On page 6, "Histopathology of Hodgkin lymphoma" section, line 7, "LPHL" should be replace with "LRHL".
8- On page 6, "Histopathology of Hodgkin lymphoma" section, line 17, infectious mononucleosis should be written with abbreviation format "IM".
9- On page 7, "Influence of EBV on prognosis of H.L" section, line 2 "in" should be replace with "In", line 3 "B" should be omitted, line 4 " in another two studies" should be replace with "two other studies".
10- On page 8, line 11, this sentence should be grammatically corrected.
11- On page 10, line 6, "treatment used" should be replace with "drug regimen".
12- On page 11, "Smooth muscle tumor" section, line15-16, late membrane protein 1 should be written with the abbreviation format "LMP1".
13- On page 12, line 1, LMP24 should be replaced with LMP2.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
Manuscript Title: EBV associated pediatric neoplasms
Public Comments:
- Based on published guidelines for assessing research reviews:
- What challenging information or obscurity in the science did make this review necessary? What was the specific question/s of the study? The objective/s of the study is/are not clear. The article addresses a broad topic. The specific purpose of the review should be stated clearly. They should be explained more in the main body text.
- The sources and methods of the citation search should be explained. Which guides used to determine the material included in, or excluded from, the review? Search strategy is not clear.

- Which were explicit methods used to determine which articles to include in the review?
The variation in the findings of the relevant studies should be stated and analyzed.
- The specific directions for new research initiatives should be proposed.
- The whole article is very long. It could be shortened without neglecting the main aims of the study.
References:
- Some of them are irrelevant and too old. References should be update and shortened. A plenty of references were used.
- Grammar Correction is needed.
- Manuscript Type should be changed to Narrative Review Article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
It is my pleasure to write you, my opinion about the article with the title " EBV associated pediatric neoplasms ".
As your journal is a pediatric journal, so it may be better ;
1- to write specifically about neoplasm and EBV relation in pediatrics groups and some parts are possible to be shorter
or omitted.
2- The article is a review article, but still I think it is so long.
3- I think in a review article evaluated data, should be reviewed the newest and updated data in every field, also by expert people in that field for example in HLH the new articles by some people such as professor Gta Janka or ...., so some parts needs revision.
after revision article is a good article for publication in this journal.
Thank you very much.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors should clarify the areas of the novelty of this review.
What is the difference between this review and other reviews in this area?
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 31 Aug 2019

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 reviewers:

Thank you for your scientific review. I corrected all recommendations as follows. Edition and added texts and references are shown by green color and correction is shown as yellow lines

Reviewer1 and Reviewer2: The article format was changed according to review article format of this journal containing context, Evidence Acquisition, results and conclusion

Reviewer3:

1- We checked spelling mistakes as much as possible. English edition was done and changes are shown on green color.
2- We tried to explain the main issues and because of highly specialized nature of this review, more detail explanation may increase the content too much that was hard for readers to accommodate.
3- This is done
4- Antigen negative phase is the phase that antigen cannot be found in blood by PCR method
5- Thank you, as you mentioned there are different contents about this matter in literature, but reference number 7 declared it as it is written in the article (rechecked by author), other types can be used alternatively.
6- Thank you all Hodgkin lymphoma abbreviations was omitted from the article.
7- Thank you LPHL changed to LRHL
8- Thank you *infectious mononucleosis* changed to IM.
9- Thank you , in in this sentence comes after the authors name and is not placed at the beginning of sentence but if you order this can be done by putting it at the beginning and this is done ..B was omitted and two other studies was replaced.
10- Thankyou the sentence" A relatively rare subset of EBV – positive DLBCL manifests in the background of chronic inflammation. These DLBCL usually occurs in different body cavities and pyothorax associated lymphoma (PAL) is the prototypic form" was substituted by ".A relatively rare subset of EBV – positive DLBCL manifests in the presence of chronic inflammation. This type of malignancy occurs in body cavities especially in pyothorax associated lymphoma".
11- Thank you treatment used changed to drug regimen

Associate Editor 1:

Thank you for your valuable comments. This article collects plenty of facts about malignancies in EBV infection and/or disease in children. The importance of this fact should be mentioned and as you can see in the conclusion part, future studies are recommended and noticed to scientists who work in this regard. The article type was changed to narrative article. We tried to collect valuable information in this topic from many articles and it took a lot f time so long text which has readable information, may have a place for publication in your journal. We change the number of references to 77. We tried to shorten the text as much as possible We added the evidence acquisition part to explain the strategy of data management.

Associate editor2:

Thank you for your comments.

1-we used articles on pediatric aspect and we shortened the text as much as possible
2- we shortened the text

3- thank you we omitted old references and we used new review articles

Associate Editor 3:
with best thanks , because of the importance of EBV infection in our country , it was needed to have a review on different malignancies and other results from this infection . So the novelty of this study was to collection of different facts about this disease in different fields.

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) 12 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 12 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
I think, still, this article needs some revision and should be summarized.
I think it is possible some parts that are not so common in children could be omitted.
some parts such as HLH might be brief, because it is not a malignancy, and the topic of the article is" EBV associated pediatric neoplasms "
Also, more revision in writing is necessary.
Thanks.

Sedigheh Rafiei Tabatabaei: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewer's comments, this manuscript needs minor revision.
Please the authors, summarize the manuscript and delete some unrelated parts.
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 editor

Thank you for your valuable revision

QUESTION1:I think it is possible some parts that is not so common in children could be omitted. Some parts such as HLH might be brief, because it is not a malignacy , and the topic of article is" EBV associated pediatric neoplasms "
Also more revision in writing is necessary

ANSWER:.We omitted AIDS related lymphoproliferative disorders part, and summarized HLH part.

More revision in writing was done and corrected parts are shown in blue highlights

Best wishes

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 26 Jan 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.