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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/pedinfect.86679
Published in: Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases: 8(2); e86679

Peer Review Report for "*Toxocara* Prevalence in Soil and Humans in Vladivostok: A Long-term Study"

Author(s): Michail Shchelkanov, Tatyana Moskvina, Yulia Nesterova, Galina Zakjarova , Khomichuk Tatyana, Irina Galkina, Marina Kiseleva

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Nov 2018
Revised Date: 4 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 5 Mar 2020

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) — 4 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Sampling method and time interval of sampling for humans should be described in the methods.
2. Please add a table for the correlation between monthly Toxocara prevalence in humans and soil samples (show the correlation coefficients).
3. How did you analyze the influence of months on the Toxocara spp. presence in sandpits in a logistic regression model?
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 7 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for the submission of Toxocara prevalence in soil and humans in Vladivostok: a long-term study manuscript.
Totally this is a sophisticated study with good English edition.
There are some notes for the authros:

- Abstract: it is better to divide the abstract main part into background, objectives, material and method, results, conclusion
- Please select keywords based on mesh
- Please specify the material and method section
- In the study area section, the “Vladivostok is a capital of it is situated on the coast of Sea of Japan” sentence is not completed
- The study time is different in the abstract and study design section (2017) and (2018)
- In toxocara in the human section the number of cases is not mentioned, what type of admitted patients were selected for investigation, what was the sampling method, as we know IgG titer may persist over the time, and can this condition affect the incidence rate estimation? (the results are reported as prevalence)

Discussion:
- What are the power and limitation of your study?
- Please write the conclusion part

Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 21 Feb 2019

Dear EIC,
This manuscript has been reviewed by two experts in the field whose reviews are appended. Based on their comments, the manuscript needs "Major revision".
The authors read instructions for authors in the following link and reformat your paper style accordingly:
http://pedinfect.com/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#research_articles.html
Yours sincerely,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 1 Mar 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Response for reviewers

Dear colleagues!
Many thanks for your careful and detailed reviews.
According with your recommendations we made the next change in manuscript:

For Reviewer 1

1. Sampling method and time interval of sampling for humans was described in methods.
2. A table for the correlation between monthly Toxocara prevalence in humans and soil samples was added (Table 3)
3. How did you analyzed the influence of months on the *Toxocara* spp. presence in sandpits in a logistic regression model? We use the bivariate logistic regression model (not multivariate), where the *Toxocara* infection(absent and present) was dependent valuable and month and access for animals were factor valuables.

For Reviewer 2

1. The abstract was diveded to to background, objectives, material and method, results, conclusion
2. 2. Key words was corrected
3. The M and M section was specified
4. 3.In study area section the “Vladivostok is a capital of it is situated on the coast of Sea of Japan” sentence is not completed – we corrected this sentences
5. The study time is different in abstract and study design section (2017) and (2018) – cirrected
6. In toxocara in human section the number of cases is not mentioned, what type of admitted patients were selected for investigation, what was the sampling method , as we know IgG titer may persist over the time , can this condition effect the incidence rate estimation?(the results are reported as prevalence) – We add the more detail description in huma section in M and M
7. 6. Discussion:
   What are the power and limitation of your study?
   Please write the conclusion part – We write the conclusion part, where noticed limitatio of our study.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 5 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The responses to the reviewer's comments should be listed in a separate file as a new cover letter. please the athors resubmit the paper after providing a point-by-point reply to each reviewer's comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 10 Nov 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Response for reviewers

Dear colleagues!
Many thanks for your careful and detailed reviews.
According with your recommendations we made the next change in manuscript:

For Reviewer 1

1. Sampling method and time interval of sampling for humans was described in methods. –lines 82-87 p.4
2. A table for the correlation between monthly Toxocara prevalence in humans and soil samples was added (Table 3)
3. How did you analyzed the influence of months on the *Toxocara* spp. presence in sandpits in a logistic regression model? We use the bivariate logistic regression model (not multivariate), where the *Toxocara* infection(absent and present) was dependent valuable and month and access for animals were factor valuables.

For Reviewer 2

1. The abstract was diveded to to background, objectives, material and method, results, conclusion – p.2 lines 3-25
2. Key words was corrected p. 2 line 26
3. The M and M section was specified – p. 3-4
4. In study area section the “Vladivostok is a capital of it is situated on the coast of Sea of Japan” sentence is not completed – we corrected this sentences – p.3 lines 59-61
5. The study time is different in abstract and study design section (2017) and (2018) – corrected
6. In toxocara in human section the number of cases is not mentioned, what type of admitted patients were selected for investigation, what was the sampling method , as we know IgG titer may persist over the time , can this condition effect the incidence rate estimation?(the results are reported as prevalence) – We add the more detail description in huma section in M and M p. 4 lines 83-87
7. 6. Discussion:
   What are the power and limitation of your study?
   Please write the conclusion part – We write the conclusion part, where noticed limitation of our study. Lines 160-167 p.6

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 12 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Ali Amanati: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 22 Jan 2020

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 26 Jan 2020

Dear Authors,
My decision about this manuscript is minor revision.
Overall, this manuscript is accepted. Please change it according to the last revision asap.
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.

Response for editors

Dear colleagues!
Many thanks for your careful and detailed reviews.
According with your recommendations, we made the next change in manuscript:

1. The prevalence in Figures 1 and 2 is correct.. We chose “prevalence” on “incidence” in Figure 3.
2. We investigates incidence rates of Toxocariasis in our study, we reconsidered the MS and chose prevalence” on “incidence”
   3. The cells in Table 4 was aligned

Sincerely, Authors

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.

Ali Amanati: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 27 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
I read the revised manuscript
I have no further comments to add ... I thank the authors for their very detailed replies to my comments on the submitted version.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 5 Mar 2020

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