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

Iranian Journal of Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijp.110203
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 31(2); e110203

Peer Review Report for "Detection and Analysis of Respiratory Pathogens in Hospitalized Children with Acute Respiratory Tract Infections by a Multiplex-PCR Assay Based on the Genetic Analyzer Platform"

Author(s): Pengbo Guo, Yanhong Wang, Mingjin Zhou, Shiyue Mei, Yibing Cheng

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	10 Oct 2020
Revised Date:	21 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	1 Apr 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) — 4 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled "Detection and analysis of respiratory pathogens in hospitalized children with acute respiratory tract infections by a multiplex-PCR assay based on the Genetic Analyzer platform" is well performed and presented. In this retrospective study, the authors have evaluated the prevalence of respiratory pathogens among 4 days to 15 years old children referred to Henan Children's Hospital from 2019 to 2020. Based on the results, the most common pathogens were human rhinoviruses, mycoplasma, and hRSV, respectively. Overall, I found that the authors provide a high quality of study and give a general overview regarding the prevalence pattern of respiratory pathogens among hospitalized children. Generally, it is a very in-depth study, well written, and well organized. Thanks.

Zahra Ahmadinejad: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 8 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,

The manuscript can be accepted after a major revision and rational answers to the following questions from the authors:
- Inclusion criteria included fever, which means all children with fever were evaluated for respiratory pathogens, is it true?
- What is the exclusion criteria?
- Sample collection is not clear
- Multiplex PCR method needs to be more explained by the authors.
- Authors did not mention to the ethical approval of the study
- Sample size of the study is very big and strange (more than 11000 hospitalized children in a - Children's Hospital) Multiplex PCR is an expensive method. Authors should explain the reason that they test all children hospitalized with diagnosis of ARTI.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by a reviewer 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.

Dear Editor,

We are grateful for the reviewers' helpful comments on our manuscript entitled "**Detection and analysis of respiratory pathogens in hospitalized children with acute respiratory tract infections by a multiplex-PCR assay based on the Genetic Analyzer platform"**. We have answered the reviewers' questions and changed the manuscript as required. The answers and revisions are summarized as follows:

Inclusion criteria included fever, it means all children with fever were evaluated for respiratory pathogens, is it true?
Respond: It is not true, some children with fever were evaluated for respiratory pathogens. The inclusion criteria was acute respiratory tract infections (ARTI), the fever was just one indication of ARTI. We excluded those children with fever caused by other factors, such as gastrointestinal infection, urinary systems infection.

What is the exclusion criteria?
Respond: Page 2, 2.1Sample collection section line 8-10.

Sample collection is not clear
Respond: Page 2, 2.1Sample collection section line 11-17.

Multiplex PCR method needs to be more explained by authors.
Respond: Page 2,2.3 Multiplex-PCR section.

Authors did not mention to the ethical approval of the study
Respond: Page 7, Ethical Approval section.

Sample size of the study is very big and strange (more than 11000 hospitalized children in a Children's Hospital) Multiplex PCR is an expensive method. Authors should explain the reason that they test all children hospitalized with diagnosis of ARTI.
Respond: The population of Henan province is about 109 million. Zhengzhou Children's Hospital is the biggest children's hospital in Henan province. It possesses 2,200 registered beds, receives an average of 2.244 million outpatient and emergency visits, 104,000 inpatients per year. We tested a part of children hospitalized with diagnosis of ARTI. We did not pay for it. Every Multiplex PCR costs about 90 dollars and about 80% of the cost is covered by medical insurance. If the doctor suggests to test, the parents of children will pay for it in most cases.

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.

Zahra Ahmadinejad: Associate Editor | **Revision** (**1**) 31 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors did revise well and the manuscript is acceptable for publication now. I am so sorry for delay in response because of Nourooze holidays.
Best Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (**1**) 1 Apr 2021

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.