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.91300
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(1); e91300

Peer Review Report for "Varicella and Dengue Co-Infection in a Child: Case Report"

Author(s): Kalenahalli Jagadishkumar, Nanda Nataraj, Usha Rani Dasappa

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 4 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 10 Dec 2019

Revision (0)

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

Mahmood Dhahir Al-Mendalawi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 1 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Please consider the following three points in the revised manuscript.
1. It is unlikely for two infections to occur concomitantly unless the patient is immunocompromised. Among immunocompromised states, HIV infection is leading. In India, HIV infection is a substantial health problem. I presume that you didn't consider occult HIV infection in the studied patient as HIV testing through the diagnostic panel of CD4 lymphocyte count and viral overload estimations was not contemplated. Please, discuss that aspect in the 'discussion section".
2. Please, pay attention to English syntax.
3. Please, follow the standard of the journal in installing the references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 5 Nov 2019

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,

Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

5 Nov 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the 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.

ANWER TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

Varicella and Dengue Co-Infection in a child

-Case Report.

Reviewer 1:
Dear author(s),
Please consider the following three points in the revised manuscript.
1. It is unlikely for two infections to occur concomitantly unless the patient is immunocompromised. Among immunocompromised states, HIV infection is the leading. In India, HIV infection is a substantial health problem. I presume that you didn't consider occult HIV infection in the studied patient as HIV testing through the diagnostic panel of CD4 lymphocyte count and viral overload estimations was not contemplated. Please, discuss that aspect in the 'discussion section".

ANS:-Sir, all these points are added in the revised manuscript and new reference has been given
2. Please, pay attention to English syntax.

ANS:-English grammer corrected— yellow colour given
3. Please, follow the standard of the journal in installing the references.

ANS:- Standard of the journal in installing the references has been followed

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.

Mahmood Dhahir Al-Mendalawi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 26 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for making the required changes in the revised manuscript. However, it didn't properly follow the standard of the journal in installing the references. The author may re-write the references again. This is an example of how to install a reference.
Jha V, Garcia-Garcia G, Iseki K, Li Z, Naicker S, Plattner B, et al. Chronic kidney disease: Global dimension and perspectives. Lancet.2013;382(9888):260–72.doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60687-X. [PubMed:23727169].

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The author should improve the manuscript as English edit.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 Nov 2019

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.

ANSWER Reviewers' Comments:

Varicella and Dengue Co-Infection in a child

-Case Report.

Reviewer 1:
Dear author(s),
Thank you for making the required changes in the revised manuscript. However, you didnt properly follow the standard of the journal in installing the references. Please, re-write the references again. This is an example of how to install a reference.
Jha V, Garcia-Garcia G, Iseki K, Li Z, Naicker S, Plattner B, et al. Chronic kidney disease: Global dimension and perspectives. Lancet.2013;382(9888):260–72.doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60687-X. [PubMed:23727169].

ANS:*-Necessary corrections done sir in the referencess*

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Please improve your manuscript as english edit.

ANS:-corrections done sir

EIC Decision:

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

Mahmood Dhahir Al-Mendalawi: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 9 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Hello
Thanks to the author for making the required changes in the revised manuscript. This manuscript is accepted in this format.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 10 Dec 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 10 Dec 2019

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