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.109345
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(3) ; e109345

Peer Review Report for "COVID-19 in Children: Do They Have a Lower Risk of Severe Infection Than Adults?"

Author(s): Mohammadreza Amiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	13 Oct 2020
Revised Date:	9 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	28 Aug 2021

Revision (0)

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

Mansour Sadeghzadeh : Reviewer

25 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The reviewed article is a short article that explains the causes of milder clinical symptoms of Covid 19 in children compared to adults. In order to make an appropriate decision, it is necessary to mention the following:
1- The chosen title is not attractive.
2-Some of the keywords should be deleted
3-English edit is necessary.
4-It is a very brief review article and It does not fully explain the proposed theories. For example, why does cross-immunity with other SARS-like viruses work in children but not in adults?

5-In line 90 of the PDF file “the Jeljeli et al. e “ should be corrected based on Ref 14.
6-The conclusion is not very relevant to the title of the article.
7-Ref 19 should be corrected.
Thanks.

Ashok Rangaiahagari : Reviewer

3 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled " COVID - 19 in Infants and Young Children. Most healthy kids are not severely affected" can be accepted with minor corrections.
1. Please use the full abbreviation when you use any word for the first time.
2. Authors can describe in methods the criteria for selection of different studies on COVID 19 like what are the keywords that they used for the selection or the PubMed or Medline studies etc
3. Authors should include the year of publication for the references quoted in the text (Page 4) Ex: Schoulen et al andWyn et al
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

8 Nov 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

8 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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 in chief and respected reviewers

I thank so much the reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions in order to improve my manuscript. Following the reviewers' concerns and observations, I made some modifications to the initial version of my manuscript.

Reviewer 1 :

The reviewed article is a short article that explains the causes of milder clinical symptoms of Covid 19 in children compared to adults. In order to make an appropriate decision, it is necessary to mention the following:

Comment 1 : The chosen title is not attractive.

Answer : Thanks for your interest in my manuscript and positive comment. Taking into account your suggestion, I modified the title of the article.

Comment 2 : Some of the key words should be deleted.

Answer : Thanks.I changed the keywords according to your suggestion.

Comment 3 : English edit is necessary.

Answer : Thanks for your thorough review and the valuable time spent on assessing my manuscript. I revised the manuscript and corrected spelling and writing errors.

Comment 4 : It is a very brief review article and It does not fully explain the proposed theories. For example, why does cross immunity with other SARS-like viruses work in children but not in adults?

Answer : Thank you for your suggestion. I revised the section "cross immunity with other SARS-like viruses " as follows:

"The immunity caused by viruses (e.g., coronaviruses) can be protective for the pediatric population (8). In this regard, Chen IM et al. indicated that adenovirus-positive patients were protected against other infections caused by coronaviruses, adenoviruses, enteroviruses, rhinoviruses, and influenza viruses (11). Also, Anderson et al. used SARS convalescent sera for neutralizing SARS-CoV-2. They found that antibodies generated against SARS-CoV exhibited SARS-CoV-2 cross-neutralizing properties (12). There may be a high level of cross-reactivity between T-cell and B-cell epitopes of SARS-CoV-2 and some SARS-like viruses, as well as antibodies generated against the relevant structural viral proteins. The absence of severe COVID-19 in areas with a high prevalence of SARS-like infections may be attributed to partial immunity due to the cross-reactivity of T-cell and B-cell epitopes, as well as antibodies (13).

On average, children up to six years of age acquire upper respiratory tract infections (URIs) eight to 12 times a year, while adolescents and adults acquire URIs two to four times a year (14). Our knowledge of other coronavirus-associated diseases (SARS and MERS) suggests that previous exposure to other respiratory viruses may make the children's immune system more resilient and cause an inability to elicit a mature immune response during the immune dysregulation phase of SARS; therefore, it is associated with lower rates of morbidity and mortality in children (8, 23)."

Comment 5 : In line 90 of PDF file “the Jeljeli et al. e “ should be corrected based on Ref 14.

Answer : Thank you for your suggestion. Corrections were made according to your recommendation.

Comment 6 : The conclusion is not very relevant to the title of the article.

Answer : Thank you for your observations. I corrected the topic "conclusion" as follows :

"COVID-19 can develop in children with mild or no symptoms. By discovering the mysterious aspects of this disease in children, we can provide important information about both optimal

immune system targeting and viral function. The asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic pediatric populations contribute to the spread of SARS-CoV-2. Therefore, future studies in this area can help researchers develop prophylactic and therapeutic strategies to combat this lethal disease."

Comment 7 : Ref 19 should be corrected.

Answer : Thanks. I revised reference number 19.

Reviewer 2 :

The manuscript entitled " COVID - 19 in Infants and Young Children. Most healthy kids are not severely affected" can be accepted with minor corrections.

Comment 1 : Please use the full abbreviation when you use any word for the first time.

Answer : Thank you for your thorough review and the valuable time spent on assessing my manuscript. I revised the manuscript and corrected this error.

Comment 2 : Authors can describe in methods the criteria for selection of different studies on COVID 19 like what are the keywords that they used for the selection or the pubmed or medline studies etc.

Answer : Thank you for your suggestion. According to your recommendation, I added the required points as follows :

" The question arises as to whether infants and young children are at a lower risk of severe COVID-19. To investigate this question, a literature search was carried out in Medline, PubMed, EMBASE, Scopus, and Web of Science databases. The following terms and keywords were used in our searches: “COVID-19 in children”; “comparison of the severity of COVID-19 in children and adults”; “clinical characteristics of COVID-19”; “SARS-CoV infection”; and “immunopathogenesis of COVID-19"

Comment 3 : Authors should include the year of publication for the references quoted in the text (Page 4) Ex: Schoulen et al andWyn et al.

Answer : I apologize for this mistake. I fixed the bug on page 4.

Best Regard

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Mansour Sadeghzadeh : Reviewer — 17 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The requested changes have been made and the manuscript can be published.
With the best regards
Mansour Sadeghzadeh MD

Ashok Rangaiahagari : Reviewer — 12 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled "COVID-19 in children: Do they have a lower risk of severe infection than adults".. can be accepted after minor corrections.
Comments
1. Manuscript needs to be edited for grammatical errors
2. In the manuscript: Introduction section at multiple places, to the references, year of publication to be mentioned like Rahimzadeh et al, Robert et al., Munmun Rawat et al, Chen IM et al, Nina Le Bert et al, Schouten et al., etc.
3. In the Virus -to - virus ... paragraph.. when some researchers are mentioned it is recommended to quote multiple references.
4. From the literature more studies can be adopted to strengthen the manuscript
5. Inclusion criteria of the studies can be included in the manuscript
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 16 Jan 2021

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,

REFEREE : EIC — 16 Jan 2021

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.

Dear Editor in chief and respected reviewers

I thank so much the reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions in order to improve my manuscript. Following the reviewers' concerns and observations, I made some modifications to my manuscript.

Reviewer 1 :

Q 1: The manuscript needs to be edited for grammatical errors.

R 1 : Thanks. The manuscript was edited by an experienced institute.

Q 2 :In the manuscript, Introduction section, at multiple places ,to the references, year of publication to be mentioned like: Rahimzadeh et al, Robert et al. , Munmun Rawat et al, Chen IM et al, Nina Le Bert et al, Schouten et al., etc.

R 2 : Thanks for the suggestion of the esteemed reviewer. I made changes and corrections in the introduction..

Q 3 : In Virus -to - virus ... paragraph.. when some researchers is mentioned it is recommended to quote multiple references.

R 3 : Thanks for your valuable comment. I have made changes and corrections in the new version of the article and I have highlighted these changes.

Q 4 : From the literature more number of studies can be adopted to strength the manuscript.

R 4 : Thanks.I have used more resources in the article and added these new references in the references section.

Q 5 : Inclusion criteria of the studies can be included in the manuscript.

R 5 : I have included the answer to this valuable comment in the article as follow :

"The relevant papers with confirmed cases of SARS- CoV-2 between January 1 and july 1, 2020 were included . Most of the studies originated from China."

Reviewer 2:

The requested changes have been made and the manuscript can be published .

R : Many thanks for the valuable comment of the esteemed reviewer.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Associate Editor

28 Aug 2021

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

REFEREE : EIC

28 Aug 2021

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