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.14572
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 14(6); e14572

Peer Review Report for "Primary Cutaneous Tuberculosis Misdiagnosed as a Deep Mycotic Infection"

Author(s): Alireza Fatemi, Parviz Toossi, Bahareh Asadzadeh, Fahimeh Abdollahimajd

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Jun 2017
Revised Date: 10 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 11 Dec 2019

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) — 12 Nov 2017

Dear AE,
The Case report was interesting but some details need revision.
Please write more about deep mycosis you have found, what was the name or type?
Please explain more about the culture of mycobacteria such as the name of the media you have used for mycobacterium and your identification methods.
Please use some newer references especially in the discussion part.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 10 Feb 2018

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- What is unique about this case?
2- What does it add to the medical literature?
3- Was there any co-infection?
4- Please add details regarding the methodology.
5- The infection caused by NTM should be taken into consideration.
6- The culture is not able to differentiate MTB from NTM. Thus, biochemical or molecular

methods should be used to confirm the results.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 May 2018

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 a major revision.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 May 2018

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs a major 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.

Manuscript ID: 14572

Title: Primary Cutaneous Tuberculosis Misdiagnosed as a Deep Mycoses

Dear Editor

Thank you for your valuable comments. The reviewers have made valuable comments, which we have addressed some comments in the enclosed revised manuscript; some comments were appreciated; however, they were not applicable about our presented case.

Best regards

Fahimeh Abdollahimajd

Assistant Professor of Dermatology

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)** 11 Dec 2019

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