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

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.98973
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 17(4); e98973

Peer Review Report for "The Prevalence of Malaria in Soldiers, Zahedan, Iran"

Author(s): Sina Sekandarpour, Minoo Shaddel

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 26 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 29 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.

Mohamad Mohsen Homayouni: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 13 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
I read the article and it had no problems and could be printed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 30 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
This article has a variety of drawbacks, some of which are outlined below:
1. This manuscript is grammatically and structurally weak and needs substantial reform.
2. The word "Army" has been introduced as a keyword but is not mentioned in the text at all.
3. The "Materials" section does not specify the name of the staining method used.
4. The volume of blood obtained from patients and the type of anticoagulant used is unclear.
5. The primers used in this study were not designed by the researcher, but in the text, the researcher claimed to have done the design.
6. The sequence of the primers used and their synthesizing partner is unclear.
7. In the Materials and Methods section, the chemicals used in the PCR reaction and their concentration are not specified.

8. In the Materials and Methods section, the temperature conditions used for the PCR reaction are not specified.
9. How was the PCR reaction performed on 300 DNA samples without "positive control"?
10. It is not clear what company the "DNA size marker" came from.
Thanks.

Rohallah Mirjani: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 2 Dec 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,

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision (0)** 2 Dec 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 (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

The manuscript with ID number 98973 was sent to you after correction according to the comments of the reviewers. I thank so much the reviewer.

- Every correction was written in red color.
- The file of the tables, figures, and the main manuscript were sent.

Best regards
(Corresponding author)

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
Please revise references (use journal abbreviation in the references section).
Please revise your manuscript in the attached file.
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 EIC

The manuscript was corrected according to the comments of the reviewers and EIC. All the correction were written in red colour.

Regards

Minoo Shaddel

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | Revision (2) 24 Dec 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 (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.

Dear EIC

Thank you for revising the manuscript.

This was corrected according to the comments of the reviewers. All the correction were written in red colour.

1- The kind of the DNA Ladder was mentioned in the figures.
2- The explanation of one of the lane in the figures was corrected.
3- The details of process of moulecular method were written.
4- The name of staining methods was mentioned.

Regards

Corresponding author

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (3) 29 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.