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

Iranian Journal of Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijp.104423
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 31(1); e104423

Peer Review Report for "COVID-19 in Neonates: A Review"

Author(s): Maryam Saeedi, Razieh Sangsari, Kayvan Mirnia

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 May 2020
Revised Date: 27 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 20 Aug 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) — 6 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
There are too many grammatical errors. The Source display is incorrect. The method part is very missing. There is no conclusion. The tables are not understandable to the reader.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 7 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
General Comment:Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript which consider some interesting applied issues. The authors designed a review on neonatal data of diagnosed as COVID-19.
Title of manuscript is systematic review but the structure of manuscript is not relevant to systematic review. So the structure should be revised.
Major comments:
1- Introduction is too long and it is written as a narrative review. Some part of introduction could be transfer to discussion.
2- The aim of study should be mentioned, clearly.
3- The method of the study is not appropriate to systematic review. I recommend that

authors consult the description of systematic review, to learn more about the writing a systematic review. Method. keywords and search strategy, databases, date of search should be mentioned in the detail.
4- Discussion section, though enough, need to be reframed and revised thoroughly. It should start with the aim of study and the main result of the study.
5- Abstract is too long. It should be modified as Structured ABSTRACT.
Thanks

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

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by two reviewers and an Associate Editor. I now have the reports of the Referees, which suggest that your manuscript might be suitable for publication following a number of revisions. I attach some reviewer comments and invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript addressing the points made.
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.

Reviewer 1:
Dear Editor,
There are too many grammatical errors. Source display is incorrect. The method part is very missing. There is no conclusion. Tables are not understandable to the reader: We corrected them
Reviewer 2:
General Comment:Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript which consider some interesting applied issues. The authors designed a review on neonatal data of diagnosed as COVID-19.
Title of manuscript is systematic review but the structure of manuscript is not relevant to systematic review. So the structure should be revised: We corrected them
Major comments:
1- Introduction is too long and it is written as a narrative review. Some part of introduction could be transfer to discussion: We corrected them
*2- The aim of study should be mentioned, clearly.*We add it in introduction.
3- The method of the study is not appropriate to systematic review. I recommend that authors consult the description of systematic review, to learn more about the writing a systematic review. Method. keywords and search strategy, databases, date of search should be mentioned in the detail. We correct them
4- Discussion section, though enough, need to be reframed and revised thoroughly. It should start with the aim of study and the main result of the study. We correct it
*5- Abstract is too long. It should be modified as Structured ABSTRACT.*We corrected them

In addition we add some new articles for update this manscript.

Thank you

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) 13 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The author(s) done some corrections. But it's need to some corrections again. There are too many grammatical errors. Source display is incorrect. The method of the study is not appropriate to systematic review. Discussion section is weak.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the third revision of the article. All the requested changes applied, and the paper also upgraded in the whole sighting.
I have no more comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 Aug 2020

Dear Author,
The second round of peer review of your manuscript has been completed, and I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has now been accepted for publication in our journal.
Thanks