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.92537
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 16(2); e92537

Peer Review Report for "Molecular Study of *Gardnerella vaginalis* Isolated from Vaginal Discharge of Women Referring to Gynecology Clinics in Chaharmahal and Bakhtiari, Iran, in 2017"

Author(s): Hossein Hashemi, Mahshid Shakibapour, Hossein Fazeli, Jaleh Varshowsaz, Zahra Aliyari, Hossein Yousofi Darani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	5 May 2019
Revised Date:	13 May 2021
Accepted Date:	16 May 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)

18 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript in Iran with this sampleing was good but the below commennts should be considered.
- In the abstract in background section (vaginal infections are common among women referred to gynecological clinics worldwide). They could have added this (but treatment modalities were not sufficient for complete remission of the disease.
- Another: (Laboratory diagnosis of vaginal infections with sensitive and specific methods are essential for treatment and
follow-up of these diseases) the Authors should better present this work as (Laboratory diagnosis of vaginal infections with more sensitive and specific methods are essential for best treatment options …)
6 % plagiarism was find thought the manuscript.
- In the material and methods section: there was mentioned (vaginal swab was collected for

every 635) were they collected samples of vaginal discharge from cervix or posterior fornix? They should be explaining more about this if all of the samples collection were done by two or more gynecologist or resident or midwifery.
- In another part they mentioned (All samples were then examined by microscope and culture. The samples were then subjected to molecular characterization. DNA from clinical samples were extracted using the QIAamp Mini kit (Qiagen).) if this sampling was used for two conventional and PCR, is t possible little residue sample was used for second examination and led to false negative. They could interpret as biased in conclusion.
- They should explain the company name and country of the kit in parenthesis.
- They should explain more about" GenBank,": what could they do?
- They mentioned in discussion section (Charles et. Al.) as reference 12 but this was not true, it is (Cartwright, C.P., et al.,)
- Another mistake is (Obata-Yasuoka) instead of ManaObata in reference 14
- And Lowe et al versus Nancy and etc.,
- There was not good English writing, it is the moderate quality which will be correct by native.
- These authors used PCR as newer option. It is the best diagnostic method nowadays or there is a more advanced method such as Real time PCR and gene cloning? The author should explain more about election of this method, is it popular or routinely used in developed country. The discussion is not attractive the authors should have added more similar and different articles and explained and interpreted these differences. They could explain limitations of study and recommendation more as rapid PCR co test with pap smear annual screening in women who attending in health center or less expensive methods like this. They could recommend this sample collection as primary prevention of PID and tubal disease in high risk group women after more study to decline in health cost. The references about this article is low and all of them were not related to this issue.
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) 11 Apr 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 Editor

Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases

Considering manuscript titled “Molecular study of Gardnerella vaginalis isolated form vaginal discharge of women referred to gynecology clinics in Chaharmahal va Bakhtiari province of Iran in 2017” reviewers comments were considered and point to point response to them are:

1- In abstract in background section (vaginal infections are common among women referred to gynecological clinics worldwide). They could have added this (but treatment modalities were not sufficient for complete remission of disease.
It was corrected.

2- Another: (Laboratory diagnosis of vaginal infections with sensitive and specific methods are essential for treatment and
follow up of these diseases) the Authors should be better present this work as (Laboratory diagnosis of vaginal infections with more sensitive and specific methods are essential for best treatment options …)

This was performed

3- In material and methods section: there was mentioned (vaginal swab was collected for every 635) were they collect sample of vaginal discharge from cervix or posterior fornix? They should be explaining more about this if all of the samples collection were done by two or more gynecologist or resident or midwifery.

With informed consent a swab from vaginal discharges was collected for every 635 women with symptoms of vaginal infections referred to gynecology clinics in Chaharmahal va Bakhtiari province of Iran in 2017 by a Gynecologist.

4- In another part they mentioned (All samples were then examined by microscope

and culture. The samples were then subjected to molecular characterization. DNA from clinical samples were extracted using the QIAamp Mini kit (Qiagen).) if this sampling was used for two conventional and PCR, is t possible little residue sample was used for second examination and led to false negative. They could interpretation as bias in conclusion.

The amount of sample used for every experiment was included in the method section.

5- They should explain company name and country of kit in parenthesis.

It was corrected

6- They should explain more about" GenBank,": what could they do?

It was explained

7- They mentioned in discussion section (Charles et. Al.) as reference 12 but this was not true, it is (Cartwright, C.P., et al.,)

It was corrected.

8- Another mistake is (Obata-Yasuoka) instead of ManaObata in reference 14 And Lowe et al versus Nancy and etc.,

It was corrected.

9- There was not good English writing, it is moderate quality which will be correct by native.

The English was revised.

10- These authors used PCR as newer option. If is best diagnostic methods in now days or there is more advanced method as Real time PCR and gene cloning? The author should explain more about election of this method, is it popular or routinely used in developed country.

It was explained in discussion section.

11- The discussion is not attractive the authors should have added more similar and different articles and explain and interpreted this differences. They could explain limitations of study and recommendation more as rapid PCR co test with pap smear annual screening in women who attending in health center or less expensive methods like this. They could recommend this sample collection as primary prevention of PID and tubal disease in high risk group women after more study to decline in health cost

The discussion section was improved and more references were included.

The manuscript was revised according the comments and the revised sections highlighted in yellow color.

With the best regards

9/5/2021

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)** 16 May 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.