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.83616
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 14(5); e83616

Peer Review Report for "Letter to Editor; Prevention of Mother-to-Child HIV Transmission (PMTCT) Program in Iran: Challenges and Achievements"

Author(s): Ensiyeh Jenabi, Salman Khazaei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Aug 2018
Revised Date: 28 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 25 Sep 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) 11 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
This article is valuable for publication, because, today, it is an important issue.
But the below notes could be mentioned based on editorial agreement.
1- The keyword is not based on mesh browser which should be corrected (: Mother, Child, HIV/AIDS, Transmission)
2- What is the mention of " ideal state"' on page 4 paragraph 1 line 2. If it is should be below 1 or 5 percent. The authors should more discuss it.
3- Definite object of the study was not in the earlier paragraph.
4- This letter is too short for introducing important works about prophylaxis and treatments of HIV infection in Iran. The authors should be discussed more by details about it until it will be as favorable as for readers.
5- No plagiarism detected.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 20 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for sharing with me in the review of this manuscript.

This letter to the editor is entitled as challenges and achievements of mother-to-child HIV transmission (PMTCT) program in Iran. All of them are based on UNAIDS data and are available on the website. I recommend focusing a bit more on current challenges after the establishment of the aforementioned program.
Regards.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 7 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Aug 2019

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

Reply to reviewers:

Many thanks for your kind comments. Corrections have been highlighted in the body of letter. In below we respond your critiques and comments points by points.

Best regard.

Reviewer 1:

This letter to editor is entitled as challenges and achievements of mother-to-child HIV transmission (PMTCT) program in Iran. All of them are based on UNAIDS data and are available in website. I recommend focusing a bit more on current challenges after establishment of aforementioned program.

Response: We added some notes in the text. Please see highlighted phrases.

Reviewer 2:

1- Keyword is not based on mesh browser which should be corrected (: Mother, Child, HIV/AIDS, Transmission)

Response: Thank you. We revised them according Mesh browser

2-What is the mention about " ideal state"' in page 4 paragraph 1 line 2. If it is should be below 1 or 5 percent. The authors should more discuss about it.

Response: Thanks for your kind comment. We explained this subject with more details.

3- difinite object of the study was not in the earlear paragraph.

Response: It was added to first paragraph of manuscript

4- This letter is too short for introduce important works about prophylaxies and treatments of HIV infction in Iran. The authors should be discouse more by details about it till it will be as favorable as for readers.

Response: We added some explanations in this regards

Sincerely yours

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) 25 Sep 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.