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 "**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:

Peer Review

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/compreped.102296
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(1) ; e102296

Peer Review Report for "Pediatrics Orbital and Preseptal Cellulitis: A 2-year Experience"

Author(s): elham shafighi shahri, Seyed Hosein Soleimanzadeh Mousavi, Jamaladdin Osmani, Gholamreza Soleimani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	1 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	2 Dec 2020
Accepted Date:	14 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 — 1 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- P-Value didn't define in study.
- You didn't study adolescence (12 to 18 years) but explain in the manuscript result.
- Manuscript didn't give any practical subject to us.
Thanks.

REFEREE : Reviewer — 2 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for choosing me as the reviewer of the article.

Comments for the authors:
- The method should be better and clearer. Is this a prospective study that has been done for 2 years?
- What is the difference between orbital cellulite and pre-septal?
- Has ophthalmological counseling been performed for patients?
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

2 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE : EIC

2 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on reviewers comments and reply to reviewers questions.
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.

Reply to reviewer:

Reviewer one:

1- *P-Value didn't define in study.*
P-value mentioned in the article and filled in the text.
2- *You didn't study adolescence (12 to 18 years), but explain in manuscript result.*
This finding was not part of the plan, but some of the patients collected by chance were also in this age range.
3- *Manuscript didn't give any practical subject to us.*
The consequences of the underlying diseases can be prevented by timely treatment and it mentioned in the text.

Reviewer two:

4- *The method should be better and clearer. Is this a prospective study that has been done for 2 years?*
The methods whitened again by some minor changes.
5- *What is the difference between orbital cellulite and pre-septal?*
This one had mentioned before and I highlighted it in text
6- *Has ophthalmological counseling been performed for patients?*
No ophthalmologic consult has done during study

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 10 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
This is a low-value article but may be helpful for sooner diagnosis
Thanks.

REFEREE : Reviewer — 11 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- In statistical analysis of data, has P- value been calculated?
- P- value is not stated in the abstract and the results
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 13 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs revision. The manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE : EIC — 13 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 (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.

reply to reviewer one-by-one

Reviewer 1:
-This is a low value article but may be help for sooner diagnosis

Thanks for judging this article and commenting on this article

Reviewer 2:
In statistical analysis of data, has P- value been calculated?
P- value is not stated in the abstract and the results

According to your request, P-Value was included in the article and highlighted

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 28 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
In the findings section, only the number was significant P-Value is mentioned.(p-value<0.05), the authors should say, what is the numerical value of p-value calculated in each of the tables?
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 29 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE : EIC — 29 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
You have opportunity for correcting the manuscript for the last time.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

reply to reviewer one-by-one

Reviewer 1:

Hi

In the findings section, only the number was significant P-Value is mentioned. (p-value<0.05) What is the numerical value of p-value calculated in each of the tables?

Answer: we did not calculate the numerical value of p-value calculated in each of the tables.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 5 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
If P-Value is not calculated, then the significant P-Value number is deleted. (pvalue<0.05)
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 7 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has a methodological error and the authors could not satisfy the reviewer.
Thanks.

REFEREE : EIC — 7 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is rejected.
Thanks.