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.67565
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 15(2); e67565

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence Rate and Phylogenetic Analysis of *Chlamydia psittaci* in Pigeon and House Sparrow Specimens and the Potential Human Infection Risk in Chahrmahal-va-Bakhtiari, Iran"

Author(s): Mohammadreza Mahzounieh, Milad Moloudizargari, Mohammad Ghasemi Shams Abadi, Zahra Baninameh, Heidar Heidari Khoei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Feb 2018
Revised Date: 2 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 12 Mar 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) — 25 Apr 2018

Dear AE,
Please note the following comments:
1- Please include the method of prevalence determination in the abstract.
2- Please mention the time of the study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 21 May 2018

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well written, has an important scientific message, and should be of great interest to the readers. However,
1. Please mention the time of study and type of study in the method section.
2. The results are not well presented and the statistical analysis section is unclear.
3. Please update references.

4. Was it not necessary to determine the microbial susceptibility of the strains studied?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 May 2018

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.

Dear editor,

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for the evaluation of our manuscript and the valuable comments. Indeed, the requested changes will tremendously improve the paper.

Please note that we have now made all the requested changes. Point by point responses have been provided for every comment of each reviewer and the final version of all changes have been highlighted in yellow and can be easily tracked in the manuscript. We wish that the revisions meet the high standards of the journal.

Please find the point-by-point rebuttal below:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Author,
The manuscript is well written, has the important scientific message, and should be of great interest to the readers. However,
1. Please mention the time of study and type of study in the method section.

We would like to thank the respected reviewer for his/her valuable comment. . we changed the study and type.
2. The results are not well presented and statistical analysis section is unclear.

The result was revised
3. Please update references.

The ref. was updated
4. Was it not necessary to determine the microbial susceptibility on the strains studied?

Because the difficult challenges regarding to culture these microbes we couldn't determine the microbial susceptibility

Reviewer 2:
Please note the following comments:
1- Please include the method of prevalence determination in the abstract

The method of prevalence determination was added to abstract.
2- Please mention the time of the study.

The time was mentioned

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)** 12 Mar 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.