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.111084
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 16(1); e111084

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Inhaled Colistin with Inhaled Amikacin-Fosfomycin in the Treatment of Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia Caused by Extensively Drug-Resistant (XDR) *Acinetobacter*: A Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Atousa Hakamifard, Naser Rahmani, Alireza Homayouni, Farzin Khorvash, Saeed Abbasi, Behrooz Ataei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 22 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 11 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)

4 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
I Review an article titled
" Comparison of Inhaled Colistin with Inhaled Amikacin-Fosfomycin in the Treatment of Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia Caused by XDR Acinetobacter: A Clinical Trial "
-Please the authors find below my views concerning the article:
1- In my opinion, given the growing prevalence of resistant organisms, especially in the ICU, and the inadequate clinical response to existing treatments, any study that can help better treat these cases is considered valuable.
2- Dear authors of the article need to answer the following question:
-Has the study been conducted in a double-blind manner?
-Has the reviewer been aware of the medication received by each group?
3- The writing of the article is very poor in English. Word to word has been changed from Persian to English. The article needs to be re-edited in this regard.
4- In the references, there is no problem.

5- It is suggested to mention the limitations of the article at the end.
Therefore, this article is only acceptable if the mentioned corrections are made.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jan 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) 24 Jan 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.

I Review an article titled
“Comparison of Inhaled Colistin with Inhaled Amikacin-Fosfomycin in the Treatment of Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia Caused by XDR Acinetobacter: A Clinical Trial“

-Please find below my views concerning the article:

1- In my opinion, given the growing prevalence of resistant organisms, especially in the ICU, and the inadequate clinical response to existing treatments, any study that can help better treat these cases is considered valuable.
Reply: Thank you.

2- Dear authors of the article need to answer the following question:

-Has the study been conducted in a double-blind manner?
Reply: Yes, this study was a randomized double-blind clinical trial study.

-Has the reviewer been aware of the medication received by each group?
Reply: Patients, researcher, and statistical analyzer were blind to the type of drug group.

3- The writing of the article is very poor in English. Word to word has been changed from Persian to English. The article needs to be re-edited in this regard.
Reply: Done. Thank you.

4- In the references, there is no problem.

5- It is suggested to mention the limitations of the article at the end.
Reply: The limitation were added at the end of the discussion.

Therefore, this article is only acceptable if the mentioned corrections are made.

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)** 11 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.