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

International Journal of Infection
Article DOI: 10.5812/iji.108109
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 8(4); e108109

Peer Review Report for "Mild Symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in a 3-Days-Old Newborn with Congenital Heart Disease: A Case Report"

Author(s): Azin Etemadimanesh, Ali Ghasemi, Mahmoud Khodabandeh, Hamid Eshaghi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Aug 2020
Revised Date:	7 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	1 Mar 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

20 Oct 2020

Dear AE,

I have read the manuscript entitled “Mild symptoms of SARS-COV-2 infection in a 3-days-old newborn with congenital heart disease: A case report” which described a newborn diagnosed with congenital heart disease and infected with the SARS-COV-2 virus. The author discussed the clinical course, administered treatments, and outcomes of SARS-COV-2 infection in an infant suffering from cardiovascular comorbidity. This article is a very good topic in the field of Quaid infection and provides valuable information on how children get it. Given the importance of this infection in the world, it is necessary to follow up more effectively on its complications and clinical symptoms in children. It is recommended that the article be accepted in the journal after minor changes. The English language of the manuscript is sufficient. But the author needs to make some changes to improve the quality of the article. In my opinion, it is better the authors follow the below points.

1. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time.
2. Keywords should be selected from MeSH Headings, not MeSH entries. You can find the appropriate keywords on "Mesh Browser" at "https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search".
3. Use the same pattern to write the article. The author should pay attention to the main format of the journal.
4. In the abstract, the results and conclusion need more details.

5. The final conclusion still needs correction. The most important details of the study should be mentioned.
Final decision: minor revision.
Kindest Regards

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 21 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
It's an interesting case report about the Mild symptoms of SARS-COV-2 infection in a 3-days-old newborn with congenital heart disease.
- Introduction the summary is the same as the main introduction of the article that needs to be changed.
- Please enter the full name of "PA_VSD" for the first time in the paper.
Regards.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Nov 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,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Nov 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.

Re: Mild symptoms of SARS-COV-2 infection in a 3-days-old newborn with congenital heart disease: A case report

Dear Dr. Kouhpayeh

Editor-in-Chief

International Journal of Infection

I sincerely thank you for your kind regards. We are truly grateful for this opportunity to revise our manuscript. It is our belief that the manuscript is substantially improved after making the suggested edits. Changes made in the manuscript are incorporated with the text. The revision has been developed in consultation with all coauthors, and each author has given approval to the final form of this revision. In the following lines all of the comments are addressed.

Faithfully yours.

Dear Editor

Reviewer #1:

Thank you for your invaluable comments. We appreciate the careful review and constructive suggestions. Here are our responses to your comments with their respective numbers.

1. Background of abstract is changed in the different form from the main text.
2. The full version of each abbreviation is mentioned in both abstract and body of manuscript for the first time.

Reviewer #2:

1. The full version of each abbreviation is mentioned in both abstract and body of manuscript for the first time.
2. All new keywords are MeSH headings.
3. Manuscript is rearranged in the journals format.
4. More details are added to the manuscript.
5. details about present case are added to final conclusion.

Again, we sincerely thank you for your kind and informative comments.

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) — 16 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The authors modified all parts of the manuscript which the reviewers mention and added some new information as well and this version of the manuscript is appropriate for accepting.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 26 Feb 2021

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

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 1 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors modified all parts of the manuscript which the reviewers mention and added some new information as well and this version of the manuscript is appropriate for accepting.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 1 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,
You modified all parts of the manuscript which the reviewers mention and added some new information as well and this version of the manuscript is appropriate for accepting.
Thanks.