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 Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/pedinfect.111940
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: In Press(In Press); e111940

Peer Review Report for "Stage-Specific Oligonucleotide Primers for the Diagnosis of Toxoplasmosis Among Iranian Pediatric Heart Transplant Recipients; Evaluation of Cotrimoxazole as a Preventive Therapy"

Author(s): Mohammad Mahdavi, Abdoulreza Esteghamati, Khadijeh Khanaliha, Shirin Sayyahfar, Elahe Orang, Farah Bokharaei-Salim , Saba Garshasbi, Borna Salemi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	10 Dec 2020
Revised Date:	14 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	14 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 | Revision (0) 15 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you so much for considering me as a reviewer in your journal. Stage-specific oligonucleotide primers for the diagnosis of toxoplasmosis among Iranian pediatric heart transplant recipients; Evaluation of cotrimoxazole as a preventive therapy. This manuscript needs Major revision.
Comments
Results
- Line 104-110: The results of ELISA are not clear. Please rewrite this part.
- Author should be defining the positive IgG group:
- 1. The total percentage of the positive group after transplant
- 2. The percentage of the positive group after transplant with the negative result before that
- 3. The percentage of the positive group after transplant with positive results of the donor before that
- Just define the percentage of groups 1 and 2 if you did not have the information of group

3.

Discussion

- The discussion part is like a review of the last studies. The comparison should be done among other studies and also, other studies and the current study.
- Line 125- 1312 and 148- 153: These lines are results and are not being in the discussion part.
- The discussion part needs to seriously consider and maybe rewriting.

References

The author should be used more up-to-date references.

Sincerely

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 24 Dec 2020

Dear AE,

The topic of this paper is useful and it seems this study can dissolve a major problem in heart transplant recipient. but for publishing this manuscript some modifying must be done:

1- Keywords must be arranged by using MeSH.

2- Some grammatical mistakes must be corrected.

3- it is better that the prevalence rate of toxoplasmosis in young people is also mentioned.

4- More explaining for the genes which are used for PCR , is necessary and the reasons of choosing them.

5- explaining that how this parasite can transfer among the human community can decrease the prevalence rate.

6- in line 130 & 132 it is better that sentences be written : in this present study..

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Jan 2021

Dear AE,

Comments for the authors:

1- Based on the results of this study, you cannot recommend the use of PCR. This study was not performed to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of PCR and the results do not indicate the need for PCR in patients studied.

2- Also, prophylaxis with cotrimoxazole cannot be definitively recommended because the design of this study is not appropriate to prove the effectiveness of an intervention; However, according to the results of other studies that show the prevalence of toxoplasmosis in heart transplant patients, it is possible that the result obtained in this study is due to prophylaxis with cotrimoxazole. This is a hypothetical phrase that you can use in the same way in the "Conclusion" section.

Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Jan 2021

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 | **Revision** (0) 20 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,

My decision about this manuscript is major 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 reviewer

Thank you so much for your detailed comments that really improve the article.

Reviewer 1:

Comments

Results

- Line 104-110: The results of ELISA are not clear. Please rewrite this part.

Reply: The result of ELISA was written according to the comment.

- Author should be defining the positive IgG group:

Reply: IgG positive and negative were defined

- 1. The total percentage of positive group after transplant

Reply: The 3 (6.5 %) out of 46 patients had positive anti-*Toxoplasma gondii* IgG antibody after transplant

- 2. The percentage of positive group after transplant with negative result before that

Reply: None of patients was positive anti-*Toxoplasma gondii* antibody after transplant and negative result before that so seroconversion from negative to positive *T.gondii* IgG antibody before and after transplantation was not found

- 3. The percentage of positive group after transplant with positive results of donor before that

Reply: Unfortunately no information about donor was available.

- Just define the percentage of group 1 and 2 if you did not the information of group 3.

Discussion

- The discussion part is like a review of the last studies. The comparison should be done among other studies and also, other studies and the current study.

Reply:

- Line 125- 1312 and 148- 153: These lines are results and are not being in the discussion part.

Reply: Thank you for your comments that truly improve the article. These lines are deleted from discussion.

- The discussion part need to serious considering and maybe rewriting.

Reply: The discussion was revised .Some paragraph were deleted and changed to improve connection between paragraphs according useful comments.

References

Author should be use more up to date references.

Reply: Two new references were added to this part.

Reviewer 2:

Dear author

1- Based on the results of this study, you cannot recommend the use of PCR. This study was not performed to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of PCR and the results do not indicate the need for PCR in patients studied.

Reply: Thank you so much that is the right point .This sentence was deleted according comment of the reviewer.

2- Also, prophylaxis with cotrimoxazole cannot be definitively recommended because the design of this study is not appropriate to prove the effectiveness of an intervention; however, according to the results of other studies that show the prevalence of toxoplasmosis in heart transplant patients, it is possible that the result obtained in this study is due to prophylaxis with cotrimoxazole. This is a hypothetical phrase that you can use in the same way in the "Conclusion" section.

Reply: Conclusion was changed according useful comments of the reviewer

Reviewer 3:

1- Key words must be arranged by using MeSH.

Reply: Key words was arranged by using MeSH

2- Some grammatically mistakes must be corrected.

Reply: The grammatically mistakes was corrected according to suggestion of respected referee.

3- It is better that the prevalence rate of toxoplasmosis in young people is also mentioned.

Reply: A sentence about the prevalence rate of toxoplasmosis in adolescence is added to the article

4- More explaining for the genes which are used for PCR, is necessary and the reasons of choosing them.

Reply: A Paragraph about the genes which are used for PCR and reasons of choosing them was added to introduction

5- Explaining about that how this parasite can transfer among human community can decrease the prevalence rate.

Reply: A paragraph about transferring infection among human community decrease the prevalence rate was added.

6- In line 130 & 132 it is better that sentences be written: in this present study.

Reply: It was added to this part of the manuscript

Associate Editor 1:

.

Comments

Common:

1- Key words must be arranged by using MeSH.

Reply: Key words was arranged by using MeSH

2- Some grammatically mistakes must be corrected.

Reply: The grammatically mistakes were corrected.

3- It is better that the prevalence rate of toxoplasmosis in young people is also mentioned.

Reply: I added a paragraph about prevalence rate of toxoplasmosis in Iranian adolescents.

Methods:

1- More explaining for the genes which are used for PCR, is necessary and the reasons of choosing them.

Reply: A Paragraph about the genes which are used for PCR and reasons of choosing them was added to introduction

2- Explaining about that how this parasite can transfer among human community can decrease the prevalence rate.

Reply: A paragraph about transferring infection among human community decrease the prevalence rate was added.

Results

- Line 104-110: The results of ELISA are not clear. Please rewrite this part.

Reply: The result of ELISA was written according to the comment.

1. Author should be defining the positive IgG group:

Reply: IgG positive and negative were defined

2. The total percentage of positive group after transplant

Reply: The 3 (6.5 %) out of 46 patients had positive anti-*Toxoplasma* gondii IgG antibody after transplant and the sentence was added.

3. The percentage of positive group after transplant with negative result before that

Reply: None of patients was positive anti-*Toxoplasma gondii* antibody after transplant and negative result before that so Seroconversion from negative to positive *T.gondii* IgG antibody before and after transplantation was not found

4. The percentage of positive group after transplant with positive results of donor before that

Reply: Unfortunately no information about donor was available

5. Just define the percentage of group 1 and 2 if you did not the information of group 3.

Discussion

1. The discussion part is like a review of the last studies. The comparison should be done among other studies and also, other studies and the current study.

Reply: The discussion was written one more time and comparison between the present study and other studies was done

2. Line 125- 1312 and 148- 153: These lines are results and are not being in the discussion part.

Reply: Thank you for your comments that truly improve the article. These lines are deleted from discussion.

3. The discussion part need to serious considering and maybe rewriting.

Reply: The discussion was rewritten and revised according the detailed comments of the respected reviewer

4. In line 130 & 132 it is better that sentences be written: in this present study.

Reply: It was added to this part of the manuscript

References

Author should be use more up to date references.

Reply: Two new references were added to this part.

Epidemiology reviewer

1- Based on the results of this study, you cannot recommend the use of PCR. This study was not performed to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of PCR and the results do not indicate the need for PCR in patients studied.

Reply: The reviewer pointed out the right point, this sentence was deleted according comment of the reviewer.

2- Also, prophylaxis with cotrimoxazole cannot be definitively recommended because the design of this study is not appropriate to prove the effectiveness of an intervention; however, according to the results of other studies that show the prevalence of toxoplasmosis in heart transplant patients, it is possible that the result obtained in this study is due to prophylaxis with cotrimoxazole. This is a hypothetical phrase that you can use in the same way in the "Conclusion" section.

Reply: Conclusion was changed according useful comments of the reviewer.

With regards

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) — 17 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
This manuscript was corrected according to the comments of the reviewers.
Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 24 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
All comments that have been mentioned, are corrected.
Thanks.

Masoud Alebouyeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 4 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript has good quality and is revised based on the reviewers' comments. It could be accepted for publication at this stage.
Sincerely yours,
Masoud Alebouyeh

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 7 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
This manuscript is corrected according to comments and could be accepted in this stage.
Sincerely yours,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 14 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,
My decision about this manuscript is acceptance.
Thanks.