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.99559
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(2) ; e99559

Peer Review Report for "Glans Ischemia Treatment with Pentoxifylline Following Circumcision in a Neonate"

Author(s): Kayvan Mirnia, Aalie Safari, Maryam Saeedi, Razieh Sangsari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 May 2020
Revised Date:	22 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	2 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

22 May 2020

I thank you for all your efforts to publish scientific manuscripts to expand the public knowledge.

My opinion is this case had moderate to severe ischemia but no necrosis.
Given that pathology was not available and due to the recovery time, there was not probably necrosis.
Manuscript title is better change from" Penile necrosis treatment with..." to "Glans ischemia treatment with....
We started a Pentoxifylline tablet based on available articles for postcircumcision ischemia of the penis in children and adult patients. You should be notice the references in this paragraph.

We started with the least dosage for this neonate after parental consent. You should be exclusively and precise dosage of drug and also notice manufacture, country and so on.

Pentoxifylline is applied in neonatal sepsis and necrotizing enterocolitis, but this was for the first time we used this drug and the first time in post-circumcision ischemia of the penis in neonates.

Multiple papers was published such as inter j urology (2005)12,705-7 and your references no: 1, 3, 4.... Please omit these lines.

You said: We prescribed antibiotics (Oxacillin and Amikacin), and Mupirocin ointment. What was the reason for using antibiotics? Did you positive culture from discharge? Or any document?

If you prescribe it as a prophylaxis, it seems that using an ointment was enough. You should be mentioned this point and use the new article in this regards in IRAN (A Survey of Pediatricians' Views and Practices Regarding Parents 'Request for Prescribing Antibiotics: A Qualitative Study. Arch Pediatr Infect Dis. 2019 July; 7(3):e91217. doi: 10.5812/pedinfect.91217.)

We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: NEC, and BPD.

It is better to do this type of study done Clinical Trial with control group so that the results are more accurate and citable. You should be mentioned this point as a one of limitations of your study.

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

We would like to appreciate the reviewer's helpful comments.

Our revise is as follow:

Reviewer 1:

Comment 1:Thanks for your precise comment; we agree with you and changed to glans ischemia and highlighted it.

Comment2:We refreshed the references.

Comment3:We added the dose and the country was made.

Comment4: we omitted for the first time treatment

Comment5: In neonatal disease, using topical antibiotics alone is a great risk. Cultures are positive in 30% of the cases, so as the most common strains are staff aureus and gram negatives implementing intravenous drugs is mandatory. We prescribed it as a treatment.

Comment6: we removed the abbreviations.

Comment7: we included our limitations and highlighted them.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

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

Thanks for your comments

Comment 1:we added your comment in introduction

Comment2:We mentioned the complications as the reviewer’s comment

Comment 3:In discussion we mentioned the content of the suggested article and included the article as refrence

Kind Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)