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

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.12446
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(2); e12446

Peer Review Report for "Bacteriology and Antimicrobial Sensitivity of Isolated Bacteria from Pressure Ulcers After Spinal Cord Injury"

Author(s): Fariba Sadeghi Fazel, Ahad Mohammadnejad, Saeid Amanpour, Alireza Abdollahi, Asal Derakhshanrad, Nazi Derakhshanrad, Mir Saeed Yekaninejad, Hooshang Saberi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 May 2017
Revised Date: 13 Oct 2018
Accepted Date: 7 Dec 2018

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 | **Revision** (0) 27 Jun 2017

Dear AE,
There are at least three main problems in the methods of this study which would mention as follows:
1. First of all, sterile swab is no precise method for microbial evaluation in infected ulcers and most guidelines prefer deep tissue biopsy after surgical debridement in operating room sterile condition.
2. As you know, anaerobic microorganisms are the main causes of soft tissue infections in pressure ulcers, especially in the wounds of the sacrum and gluteal regions. Based on the sampling method section the anaerobic methods have been not used for transport medium and main microbial identification cultures.
3. The disc diffusion method (Muller- Hinton Agar medium employing Kirby Bauer method) which used in the study is not a reliable method for determining the antibiotic susceptibility of microorganisms, particularly for Gram-negative bacilli. These days identification of minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) is the standard process for antibiotic susceptibility determination of microorganisms.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Jul 2017

Dear AE,
The article is acceptable as original version after revise.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 29 Aug 2017

Dear AE,
1. There are two models abstract that are similar, but the keywords are different.
2. The beginning of the introduction is very good, but the conclusions that have been made to carry out the research are not very persuasive.
3. In the end section of the introduction, the reason for the study, is not very relevant to the beginning of the introduction .
4. In the methodology section, the center for doing good research is described, referring to (AIS), which is not described what is it.
5. Have a specific reason for using these including criteria? Have a reference?
6. In the subscales, the sphincter management does not explain exactly .
7. Sampling of the wound and the use of antibiotics are well described.
8. In the findings, bacterial colitis was found to be greater in people who did not have intestinal control, How are they measured to have good intestinal control? Asked in demographic form?
9. The first part of the discussion is described as very long and needs to be summarized.
10. Table 3 and 4 should be deleted and reference them in the text.
11. Both circular diagrams of the end of the article are essentially the same, and repeated. Both have been written in the name of figure 1, and in the text , there is no reference to what the purpose of this diagram is.
Some more comments included in the attached file
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Aug 2017

Dear EIC,
The manuscript should be revised based on reviewers comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 Aug 2017

Dear Author,
The manuscript still needs revision.
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 respected Editor-In-Chief

Professor Zahid Hussain Khan

Journal of Archives of Neuroscience

Ref: **Bacteriology and Antimicrobial Sensitivity of Isolated Bacteria from Pressure Ulcers after Spinal Cord Injury** (Manuscript ID: 12446)

We do have received your kind letter about minor revision request for our manuscript entitled "Bacteriology and Antimicrobial Sensitivity of Isolated Bacteria from Pressure Ulcers after Spinal Cord Injury". Many thanks to the esteemed reviewers for their appreciable views.

We have prepared a thoroughly revised manuscript as recommended by the respectful reviewers named as revised manuscript.

In the following lines the response to the reviewers comments may be found.

Reviewer # 1:

All comments were considered.

Reviewer # 2:

1. In the examination and microbial sampling of infectious wounds, both sterile swabs and deep biopsy have been recommended. Each healthcare center adopts and executives its own guidelines following professors' views and circumstances. In our hospital, sterile swab is the first option and if need be, biopsy will be conducted on a low percentage of patients.
2. Aerobic and anaerobic organisms can both give rise to infection. As noted in the objectives of this study, aerobic organisms were considered. The culture and transport mediums for these organisms have been specified and in the next phase, anaerobic infections will be studied in another survey.

3. The common method applied in our country in all hospitals for examining antibiotic sensitivity is disk diffusion, which is a scientific and standard method. Few healthcare centers apply MIC. Therefore, we used disk diffusion in this study as it is common in all microbiology centers in the country.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 8 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
The authors have included suggested changes and the paper is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 5 Dec 2018

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 7 Dec 2018

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