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.113203
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: In Press(In Press); e113203

Peer Review Report for "Is the *Rattus norvegicus* Population Playing a Role in the Transmission of Zoonotic Diseases to Children? A Pilot Study in Tehran, Iran"

Author(s): Taher Azimi, Fatemeh Fallah, Mohammad Reza Pourmand, Abdollah Karimi , Shahnaz Armin, Mohammad Rahbar, Leila Azimi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 6 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 10 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 4 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Since this study is a pilot survey, it is necessary to discuss the survey features required in this area on a larger scale. These features should be explained according to the results of this pilot study.
Regards

Masoud Alebouyeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Title: Is the Rattus norvegicus population playing a role in the transmissionof zoonotic diseases to children? A pilot study in Tehran, Iran
Result: Manuscript could be accepted. It is presented in good style and related results are logical.
Grammatical errors should be corrected. Some of them are shown below:
1. The sampling strategy will be designed to trap similar numbers of 114rats in five districts.

The sampling will be performed after sundown in every five 5districts and processed during the next morning.
2. PCR was conducted under the following condition
3. The results of sequencing….
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 6 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the submission of the “Is the Rattus norvegicus population playing a role in the transmission of zoonotic diseases to children? A pilot study in Tehran, Iran” manuscript,
Comments for the authors:
- Abstract: please specify which test was done on serum and feces of rats.
- Please add rabies to keywords
- Introduction: an introduction is very long, please summarize the important issues of your study in Rattus norvegicus. And describe why you choose this rat for your study. please describe the epidemiology of this animal in Tehran and its population among other rodents.
- Method: please describe how you calculated the sample size.
- Discussion: please describe a similar study in Iran if it is present, and describe the gender difference of positive results in rats. please describe the limitation and strengths of your study. please add the conclusion part.
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 14 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
My decision about this manuscript is Minor Revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 15 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
My decision about this manuscript is minor 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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear author

Thank you for submission of “Is the Rattus norvegicus population playing a role in the transmission of zoonotic diseases to children? A pilot study in Tehran, Iran”

manuscript

Abstract: please specify which test was done on serum and feces of rats.

Response: Dear reviewer, thank you for your comments. Based on your comments, the following sentence was added to the abstract section.

“Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) assay was done on serum to screen for specific antibodies against *Leptospira* spp. and Rabies virus. Also, PCR was performed to detect the prevalence of *V. vulnificus* using specific primers.”

Please add rabies to keywords

Response: It was corrected.

Introduction: introduction is very long; please summarize the important issues of your study in rattus norvegicus. And describe why you choose this rat for your study.

The introduction was summarized. We choose this rat because of these is the most common genus of rat in urban environments, globally. Also, these rodents can reservoir the main zoonotic disease and can transfer to human.

The epidemiology of this animal in Tehran and its population among other rodents:

Response: Dear reviewer, thank you for your helpful comments. We tried to get information about the distribution of rats within Iran, among different countries, and in continents. However, there is no data on this issue and unfortunately, we could not find it.

Method: please describe how you calculated the sample size.

Response: Dear reviewer, thank you for your helpful comments. Our study is a pilot study and the sample size and sampling number per region were determined based on our budget.

Discussion: please describe about similar study in Iran if it is present, and describe the gender difference of positive results in rats. please describe the limitation and strength of your study. please add the conclusion part.

Response: Done and acknowledged.

Best regards

Reviewer 2:

Title: Is the Rattus norvegicus population playing a role in the transmission of zoonotic diseases to children? A pilot study in Tehran, Iran

Result: Manuscript could be accepted. It is presented in good style and related results are logical.

Grammatical errors should be corrected. Some of them are shown below:

1. The sampling strategy will be designed to trap similar numbers of 114rats in five districts. The sampling will be performed after sundown in every five 5districts and processed during the next morning.

2. PCR was conducted under the following condition

3. The results of sequencing….

Response: We apologize for the overlooked mistakes. The manuscript was carefully edited by a native English speaker.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear author

Since this study is a pilot survey, it is necessary to discuss the survey features required in this area on a larger scale. These features should be explained according to the results of this pilot study.

Regards

Response: Dear editor, thank you for your comments. It was corrected.

Associate Editor 2:

My decision about this manuscript is Minor Revision

EIC Decision:

My decision about this manuscript is minor revision.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 10 Mar 2021

Dear Author,

My decision about this manuscript is accepted.

Thanks.