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.93637
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 14(6); e93637

Peer Review Report for "High Prevalence of Drug-Resistant Gram-Negative Bacteria: A Hospital-Based Cross-Sectional Study in Tehran, in 2017"

Author(s): Fahimeh Hadavand, Latif Gachkar, Maryam Amini

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 May 2019
Revised Date: 17 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 22 Dec 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) — 18 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
The subject of this paper is interesting but because of some mistakes in the structure of this article and also the method. The authors should find the enclosed for the comments.
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
This paper does not add to the knowledge of microbiology and infectious disease and can publish in a local journal, of course with major corrections. In my opinion, it is not suitable to publish in the Archives of Clinical Infectious Disease Journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The authors should consider the following comments:
1- It is recommended to include the year of the study in the title.

2- Please mention the name of used culture media.

3- Why coagulase test performed for gram-negative bacteria?

4- Please re-check the English writing and grammar of the manuscript.

Thanks.

Bita Pourkaveh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

3 Nov 2019

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)

10 Nov 2019

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,

Thank you for your considering our original manuscript "**High prevalence of drug-resistant gram-negative bacteria: a hospital-based cross-sectional study in Tehran, Iran**". We thank the editor and reviewers for their thoughtful critique and comments. We have addressed all the comments. We have carefully edited the manuscript as requested by reviewers and have provided a point-by-point response below. Please find the revised version included. We hope this meets the established reputation for quality of your esteemed journal.

Thank you for considering out manuscript.

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear authors, the subject of this paper id interesting but because of some mistakes in structure of this article and also method. Please find the enclosed for the comments. Regards.

Response: *Dear reviewer, we have carefully reviewed and revised the manuscript based on the reviewer's thoughtful comments.*

Reviewer 2: Please consider the following comments:

1- It is recommended to include the year of the study in title.

Response: *Done as requested.*

2- Please mention the name of used culture media.

Response: *Done as requested.*

3- Why coagulase test performed for gram negative bacteria?

Response: *We have used coagulase test for initial screening and for exclusion of any gram positive isolates.*

4- Please re check the English writing and grammar of manuscript.

Response: *Dear reviewer, the manuscript English was carefully audited.*

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)** 22 Dec 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.