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.86097
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 15(2); e86097

Peer Review Report for "A Cross Sectional Survey on Tissue Transglutaminase Auto-Antibodies in Patients with Pulmonary and Extra Pulmonary Tuberculosis"

Author(s): Iraj Shahramian, Ameneh Rezaei Keikhaei, Omolbanin Sargazi Aval, Mojtaba Delaramnasab, Ali Bazi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Nov 2018
Revised Date: 23 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 9 Feb 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) 14 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Abstract
- It is not stated where this research has done.
- Keywords are not separated by semicolon .
- Four to seven MeSH term keywords are not provided.
Methods
- It is not stated treatment for TB.(standard regimen??)
- The basis on which potentially eligible participants were identified (such as symptoms for extra pulmonary TB ,methods of diagnosis for extra pulmonary and only smear for pulmonary ,about culture and pattern of resistance) is not introduced.
- Time interval between TB diagnosis and blood sampling is not stated.
- It is not described about patient follow-up (when, how).
- It is not stated whether participants formed a consecutive , random ,convenience series.
Discussion

- Study limitations, including the source of potential bias, statistical uncertainty are not discussed.
- It does not have good relation with title and background.
- The goal of this research is about relation between infection such as TB and auto immune diseases such as CD.
- It is not included references about infection and CD.
- Sentences about vitamin D are without references.

Additional information

- Acknowledgment section is not present at the end of the article.
- Source of funding and other support (such as supply for lab) and role of funders are not disclosed.
- Conflict of interest section is not present at the end of article.
- The text needs absolutely grammar editing.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Bita Pourkaveh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Jan 2020

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,

Masoud Mardani: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the 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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Acceptable

Thank you for taking your time reading our manuscript and expressing your valuable comment.

Reviewer 2:
abstract
it is not stated where this research has done.

Reply: Thank you for taking your time reading our manuscript and expressing your valuable comment. Done.

keywords are not separated by semicolon .

Reply: Done.

four to seven MeSH term keywords are not provided.

Reply: The keywords are 4 now.

Methods
it is not stated treatment for TB.(standard regimen??)
the basis on which potentially eligible participants were identified(such as symptom for extra pulmonary TB ,methods of diagnosis for extra pulmonary and only smear for pulmonary ,about culture and pattern of resistancy)is not introduced.
time interval between TB diagnosis and blood sampling is not stated.
it is not described about patient follow up (when .how).
it is not stated whether participants formed a consecutive , random ,convenience series.

Reply: Our choosing of patient was based on clinical archives of patients registered at the Respiratory Diseases Management center of Zabol city. The diagnosis and management of these patients were based on national standards (http://tblep.behdasht.gov.ir/Tutorial_Documents_Inside.aspx).

Actually, we enrolled all the patients by accessible sampling (highlighted) in the study and we only knew that these had been diagnosed and we only had access to general data and could not extract the exact regimen or the duration of treatments or they follow up. What we had been told was that management was based on national standard that we provided here for observation.

study limitation ,including source of potential bias, statistical uncertainty are not discussed.

Reply: limitation was added prior to conclusion.

it does not have good relation with title and background.
the goal of this research is about relation between infection such as TB and auto immune diseases such as CD.
it is not included references about infection and CD.
sentences about vitamin D is without references.

Reply: We modified the text in some points to draw a relevant text according to our aim. These are highlighted whenever indicated. Relevant references were added.

acknowledgment section is not present at the end of the article.
source of funding and other support (such as supply for lab),and role of funders are not disclosed.
conflict of interest section is not present at the end of article.

Reply: These were provided.

the text needs absolutely grammar editing.

Reply: the text was edited (green—highlighted).

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)** 9 Feb 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.