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

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/compreped.100496
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(2); e100496

Peer Review Report for "Toxic Epidermal Necrolysis Syndrome Following Single-Dose Diclofenac Suppository, A Case Report"

Author(s): Mojtaba Kamali Aghdam, Akefeh Ahmadiafshar, Kambiz Eftekhari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 3 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 16 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

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

Armen Malekian Taghi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The nature of the disease is rare and fatal; information on the treatment and prognosis of the disease is essential. So the publication of this interesting article seems appropriate.
Thanks.

Sayed Alinaghi Kazemi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 22 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
I accept this article with minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 22 Jan 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 minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 22 Jan 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.

Reviewer 1:

Q: [reviewer's 1 question]:

and inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).

R: [author's 1 reply]:

In-Page 2, Line 3 the Sentence of “and inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs)” was added.

Q: [reviewer's 2 question]:

Points must be after references

R: [author's 2 reply]:

In-Page 2, Line 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20, and 22, the points were made after the reference.

In-Page 3, Line 2: the points were made after the reference

In-Page 4, Line 17, and 19: the points were made after the reference

In-Page 5, Line 3, 5, 8, 14, and 15: the points were made after the reference

---

Q: [reviewer's 3 question]:

diclofenac

R: [author's 3 reply]:

In-Page 4, Line 20: Diclofenac was corrected.

Q: [reviewer's 4 question]:

had no liver involvement

R: [author's 4 reply]:

In-Page 5, Line 9: The sentence “and normal liver enzymes” was removed.

Q: [reviewer's 5 question]:

delete space

R: [author's 5 reply]:

Removed spacing from all references.

Reviewer 2:

Q: [reviewer's first question]:

The nature of the disease is rare and fatal; information on the treatment and prognosis of the disease is essential.
So publication this interesting article seems appropriate.

R: [author's first reply]:

Thank you for your attention and kindness.

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.

Sayed Alinaghi Kazemi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 10 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
With Thanks in the article of Toxic Epidermal Necrolysis Syndrome following Single-dose Diclofenac Suppository, A Case Report. There is no Plagiarism detection in the manuscript, the Analysis method of the manuscript is good. The Results are sufficient. My decision about this manuscript is accept with minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Feb 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Feb 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.