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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/archcid.82209
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 16(3); e82209

Peer Review Report for "Molecular Identification of *Leishmania* Species in an Outbreak of Re-Emerged Cutaneous Leishmaniasis in Southwestern Iran During 2015 - 2016"

Author(s): Mehri Kargar, Homa Hajjaran , Javad Moazen, Mohammad Reza Shirzadi, Elham Kazemirad, Hamid Kalantari, Aref Teimouri, Mehdi Mohebali

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	16 Jul 2018
Revised Date:	21 May 2021
Accepted Date:	27 Jun 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) — 28 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Greetings and thanks for the following corrections
- Modify and complete Table2 and Figure 4
- Compounds of PCR and enzymes are written based on concentration, not volume
- Mortality statistics and the prevalence of referrals 4 are incorrect (modified)
- The reference primer is written and it is better to have the ACCESSION selective gene number so that the primer location is accessible.
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) 2 May 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.

Dear “Prof. Masoud Mardani”
Editor in Chief “Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases”

Thank you for giving the opportunity to submit a revised draft of our manuscript titled [Molecular identification of *Leishmania* species in an outbreak of re-emerged cutaneous leishmaniasis in the south west of Iran during 2015–2016] to [Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases] with reference number (MS No. 82209). We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper.
Here is a point-by-point response to the editor and reviewer comments.

Reviewer 1:
Modify and complete Table2 and Figure 4
Response: modification was done for Table 2 and Figure 4.

Compounds of PCR and enzymes are written based on concentration, not volume
Response: modification was done (Lines 138-144 and lines 151-154).

Mortality statistics and the prevalence of referrals 4 are incorrect (modified)
Response: modification was done (Lines 78, 79).

The reference primer is written and it is better to have the ACCESSION selective gene number so that the primer location is accessible.
Response: modification was done (Lines 138-140).

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)** 27 Jun 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.