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.105501
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 16(1); e105501

Peer Review Report for "Unexpected Role of Rotavirus G3P[8] Infection in Causing Severe Diarrhea in a Major Tertiary Referral Hospital in the Prevaccine Era"

Author(s): Wassim Chehadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	20 May 2020
Revised Date:	21 Apr 2021
Accepted Date:	24 Apr 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)

14 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for the submission of the article.
Totally this is a valuable study on the study of rotavirus strains before vaccination in Kuwait, please follow the instruction for authors for the format of the article.
- Some of the sentences are very long and hard to understand
- ABSTRACT: should be 250 words
- BACKGROUND: please explain the epidemiologic importance of rotavirus strains study in children's stool. Please discuss the other study results about the rotavirus in comparison to your study in the discussion
- METHOD: Please mention the ethical code. What is the definition of severe diarrhea, Please explain the sampling method
Please give the other patients characteristics and compare the results based on them. For example season, daycare attendance, and other variables if applicable.
- DISCUSSION: Please describe why "The detection in our study of rotavirus G or P genotypes not included in the monovalent Rotarix vaccine or the polyvalent RotaTeq vaccine, does not indicate vaccine inefficiency"

- Please compare the results of rotavirus strains of other studies with your study
- REFERENCES: please include more up to date references from 2019, 2020
Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
A very good to excellent paper without novelty in the world but could use to design a new vaccine.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 3 Apr 2021

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** (0) 10 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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 to reviewers' comments

Reviewer 1 comments:

"please follow the instruction for authors for the format of the article."

Response: The manuscript is written using the journal's format

"Some of the sentences are very long and hard to understand"

Response: A comma or full stop were added to the long sentences for better understanding

"ABSTRACT: should be 250 words"

Response: the abstract has 238 words

"BACKGROUND: please explain the epidemiologic importance of rotavirus strains study in children's stool. Please discuss on the other study results about the rotavirus in comparison to your study in the discussion"

Response: the epidemiologic importance of rotavirus strains study in children's stool was added to the Background section (highlighted in Yellow). Also, the relevant results from other studies were added to the Discussion section (highlighted in Yellow).

"METHOD: Please mention the ethical code. What is the definition of severe diarrhea, Please explain the sampling method"

Response: The ethical statement is already included in the Methods section. Severe diarrhea is now defined in the new version of the manuscript (highlighted in Yellow). Sampling method was also added to the new version of the manuscript (highlighted in Yellow).

"Please give the other patients characteristics and compare the results based on them. For example season, daycare attendance, and other variables if applicable."

Response: As stated in the results, season distribution of rotavirus cases is described. Unfortunately, other variables and daycare attendance data are not available.

"DISCUSSION: Please describe why "The detection in our study of rotavirus G or P genotypes not included in the monovalent Rotarix vaccine or the polyvalent RotaTeq vaccine, does not indicate vaccine inefficiency"

Response: An explanation plus a reference were added to the new version of the manuscript (highlighted in Yellow). There are also real examples from different countries that have been already included in the manuscript.

"Please compare the results of rotavirus strains of other studies with your study"

Response: the relevant results from other studies were added to the Discussion section (highlighted in Yellow).

"REFERENCES: please include more up to date references from 2019, 2020"

Response: Two references (2020) and 3 references (2018) were added to the new version of the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

"A very good to excellent paper without novelty in the world but could use for design a new vaccine"

Response: we thank all the reviewers for their valuable comments that have hopefully improved the quality of the paper.

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)** 24 Apr 2021

Dear Author,

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

Thanks.