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.110647
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 16(2); e110647

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Endocervical *Chlamydia trachomatis* Infection and Related Risk Factors Among Women Attending Gynecology Clinic of Birjand University of Medical Sciences, East of Iran"

Author(s): Nahid Gahanbarzade, Elham Ramazani, Masoud Yousefi, Mahmoud Zardast, Majid Zare-Bidaki

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 26 Oct 2020
- Revised Date: 3 May 2021
- Accepted Date: 9 May 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) 19 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- The manuscript must be written in native English.
2- Why did you use a DNA extraction kit for RT-PCR?
3- What is the reference gene and target gene in this test?
4- How did you measure cDNA quality?
5- what master mix kit was used in the test?
6- All equipment used in the test must specify the manufacturer's and country's name.
7- The method is short and concise, explain more.
8- Part of the discussion doesn't have the reference number.
9- Why did only 153 of 157 people with a history of pregnancy have vaginal and cesarean delivery? Statistic needs to be revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 3 Apr 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) 10 Apr 2021

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.

May, 01, 2021

Manuscript ID **110647** entitled "**Prevalence of endocervical Chlamydia trachomatis infection and related risk factors among women attending the Gynecology Clinic of Birjand University of Medical Sciences, East of Iran**"

Dear Prof. Masoud Mardani

Editor-in-Chief, Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases

Items requested by reviewers in their recommendations were revised in the manuscript as follows:

Reviewer 1

1. The manuscript was revised by two native English speakers for further improvement of the language.

2. In this study, the Real-Time PCR method by utilizing a commercial kit (GeneProof *Chlamydia trachomatis* PCR kit) was used to identify *Chlamydia trachomatis* infection, and no study of gene expression was targeted in this study. The target sequences in this PCR kit are the cryptic plasmid multi-copy sequence and the 16S rRNA gene for *C. trachomatis*. Therefore, the aim of this study was to evaluate the DNA sequence to identify the infection.

3. No gene expression was evaluated in this study. The target sequences in this PCR kit are the cryptic plasmid multi-copy sequence and the 16S rRNA gene for *C. trachomatis*.

4. No gene expression was evaluated in this study.

5. The type of master mix used was added to the text.

6. The manufacturer's and country's name of all equipment used was added to the text.

7. Some explanations for the procedure were added to the text. It should be noted that due to the use of commercial kits to diagnose infection, some details of commercial kits are not available.

8. Some references were added to the discussion.

9. The four subjects were women who had experienced their first pregnancy with an abortion.

Best 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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 9 May 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.