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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Hepatitis Monthly
Article DOI: 10.5812/hepatmon.104415
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 20(6); e104415

Peer Review Report for "An 11-Year-Old Boy Infected with COVID-19 with Presentation of Acute Liver Failure"

Author(s): Amir Saeed, Eslam Shorafa, Iraj Shahramian, Mahdi Afshari, Mehrdad Salahifard, Fateme Parooie

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 May 2020
Revised Date: 17 May 2020
Accepted Date: 1 Jun 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Heidar Sharafi: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 4 May 2020

Dear EIC,
I reviewed this case report and found it interesting however I feel authors need some amendments before acceptance of their manuscript for publication in Hepatitis Monthly. Please find my comments:
1. The manuscript needs to be edited by a colleague who is expert in academic writing. The current use of many paragraphs should be revisited. The punctuation needs revision and many more should be considered as writing a scientific article.
2. In discussion, the authors need to stress that the COVID-19 was the etiology for acute liver failure and how they ruled out other causes of acute liver failure including viral hepatitis and non-viral liver diseases.
3. Authors should include more about liver diseases in adults with COVID-19. The findings of other studies showing a range of liver diseases from mild enzyme elevation to acute liver failure (including their percentage).
Thank you.

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | Revision (0) — 5 May 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

.Thank you for reviewing my manuscript and leaving such useful comments

.I have tried my best to revise this manuscript and improve the quality of it

: Here is what I have done

1. *The manuscript needs to be edited by a colleague who is expert in academic writing. The current use of many paragraphs should be revisited. The punctuation needs revision and many more should be considered as writing a scientific article.*

   (It is edited by an expert in academic writing)

2. *In discussion, authors need to stress that the COVID-19 was the etiology for acute liver failure and how they ruled out other causes of acute liver failure including viral hepatitis and non-viral liver diseases.*

   (I have included all the diagnostic tests that we have done)

   3. Authors should include more about liver diseases in adults with COVID-19. The findings of other studies showing a range of liver diseases from mild enzyme elevation to acute liver failure (including their percentage).

   (I included more related studies)

Thank you

Best 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.

Heidar Sharafi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been improved however I have few more minor specific comments on the presentation of the manuscript:
1. In the title, "An 11 year-old boy ..." instead of "A 11 year-old boy ...".
2. All abbreviations should be included in full in their first use such as ALT, AST, AKP
3. Figure 1 should be referred in the manuscript body.
4. Tables 1 and 2 can be merged. The reference intervals can be presented in an additional column in this new merged table.
5. punctuation should be revised. Such as "Our patient had a negative COVID-19 test followed by a positive result", this sentence needs a full stop at the end.
Regards

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 May 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.

:Dear reviewer

.Thank you for reviewing my manuscript and leaving such useful comments

.I have tried my best to revise this manuscript and improve the quality of it

: Here is what I have done

1.In title, "An 11 year-old boy ..." instead of "A 11 year-old boy ...".

DONE

2. All abbreviations should be included in full in their first use such as ALT, AST, AKP

DONE

3. Figure 1 should be referred in the manuscript body.
DONE

4. Tables 1 and 2 can be merged. The reference intervals can be presented in additional column in this new merged table.
DONE

5. punctuation should be revised. Such as "Our patient had a negative COVID-19 test followed by a positive result", this sentence needs a full stop at the end.

DONE

Thank you

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.

Heidar Sharafi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 30 May 2020

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

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (2) 1 Jun 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.