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 Clinical Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/archcid.101296
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 16(1); e101296

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Pre-TURP Bladder Irrigation with 0.2% Chlorhexidine in Patients with Foley Catheter Regarding Postoperative Bacteremia Decrease"

Author(s): Mohammad Hatef Khorrami, Seyed Hamed Jahangiri, Farshid Alizadeh, Farbod Khorrami, Mohammad Hossein Izadpanahi, Farhad Tadayon, Mehrdad Mohammadi Sichani, Mahtab Zargham, Mohsen Meidani, Darioush Shokri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Jan 2020
Revised Date:	28 Sep 2020
Accepted Date:	15 Nov 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) — 5 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Please adjust the paper according to journal format.
2- Please discuss more on important data extracted from this study in discussion section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 27 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
I Review the article titled “The effect of bladder irrigation with 0.2% chlorhexidine before TURP in patients with a Foley catheter regarding postoperative bacteremia decrease; “
The authors might find below my views concerning the article:
1-This article is not a research priority, and not solve particular problems in the Community.
2- The sample size is small.

3- The sampling technique has not been explained and, depending on the results obtained, may not be a suitable technique.
4- The term asymptomatic bacteremia is incorrect. A patient with bacteremia becomes symptomatic. Therefore, high procalcitonin alone cannot be considered bacteremic.
In the Result section, the Authors should provide a comparative table for all similar studies till now (with a clear search strategy in PubMed, Scopus, Medline and etc.) that includes a year of report/country, age, sex method, and outcome.
5- The English version of the article is poor and needs to be re-revised.
6- The discussion section of the article is not well written and needs to be rewritten.
7-The code of ethics of the article needs to be written
8- Many references are outdated and should be deleted.
So, unfortunately, I regret to inform you that it does not suit our present needs and could not be accepted for publication
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Sep 2020

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) 6 Sep 2020

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
1-Please adjust paper according to journal format. *I prepared paper according to journal format.*

2- Please discuss more on important data extracted from this study in discussion section. It was added by red color

Reviewer 2:
Dear Author
I Review article titled
"The effect of bladder irrigation with 0.2% chlorhexidine before TURP in patients with a Foley catheter regarding postoperative bacteremia decrease; "

Please find below my views concerning the article:
1-This article is not a research priority, and not solve particular problems in the Community.

TURP is a gold standard for surgical treatment of patients with BPH. Moreover, these patients have Foley catheter and bacteriuria. Bacteriuria following this procedure leads to bacteremia and septicemia. PCT is one of the indexes of bacteremia and septicemia. Therefore, it seems that via measuring PCt can prevent this action.

In discussion part, it was rewrite.

2- The sample size is small. *The sample size is chosen according to statistical expert and statistical community size. Moreover, table 3 showed studies with fewer sample size in this regard.*

3- The sampling technique has not been explained and, depending on the results obtained, may not be a suitable technique. This clinical trial study was conducted in urology department of Alzahra hospital from 2017 to 2018 on patients with BPH who were candidate for TURP. Then participants were **randomly** allocated into 2 groups (case and control groups) (**by random number table**.)

4- The term asymptomatic bacteremia is incorrect. A patient with bacteremia becomes symptomatic. Therefore, high procalcitonin alone cannot be considered bacteremic.. . OK. .It was an error. It was corrected. Thank you.

In the Result section, Authors should provide a comparative table for all similar studies till now (with clear search strategy in PubMed, Scopus, Medline and etc.) that includes a year of report/country, age, sex method, and outcome. We provide Table 3 in this regard. It was shown in text.

5- The English version of the article is poor and needs to be re-revised.
6- The discussion section of the article is not well written and needs to be rewritten.
7-The code of ethics of the article needs to be written. Ethics code were mention in text. (IR. MUI.MED.REC 1397.073)

8- Many references are outdated and should be deleted. Old references were deleted.

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.

Masoud Mardani: EIC | **Revision (1)** 15 Nov 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.