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.99804
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 15(5); e99804

Peer Review Report for "The Expression of Efflux Pump Genes in Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) Strains Isolated from Blood Cultures in Iran"

Author(s): Arezoo Bostanmaneshrad, Jamileh Nowroozi, Gita Eslami, Ali Hashemi

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 28 Dec 2019
- Revised Date: 29 Sep 2020
- Accepted Date: 11 Oct 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Jalal Mardaneh: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 5 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- Please adjust keywords according to mesh.
2- Add ethical code in materials and methods section.
3- Please add manufacturer (country) of materials consumed in this study in materials and methods section.
4. Pleases discuss more on significant data extracted from present study in discussion section.
5. Use fallowing studies performed on Staphylococcus aureus in introduction or discussion section, and refer to these papers.
- Parvin Hassanzadeh, et al. Isolation of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus (MRSA) From HIV Patients Referring to HIV Referral Center, Shiraz, Iran, 2011-2012.Iran J Med Sci . 2015 Nov;40(6):526-30.
-Bahman Poorabbas, et al. Nosocomial Infections: Multicenter Surveillance of Antimicrobial Resistance Profile of Staphylococcus Aureus and Gram Negative Rods Isolated From Blood and Other Sterile Body Fluids in Iran.Iran J Microbiol . 2015 Jun;7(3):127-35.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should update references and discussion comprehensively.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 Sep 2020

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

,Dear editor

We are very excited to have been given the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We want to extend our appreciation for taking the time and effort necessary to provide such insightful guidance.

:RESPONSES TO THE REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Comment: Please adjust keywords according to mesh

Response: Thank you. It has been corrected.
Comment: Add ethical code in materials and methods section.
Response: No funding or financial support was granted for this research.
Comment: Please add manufacturer (country) of materials consumed in this study in materials and methods section.
Response: It has been corrected.
Comment: Please add manufacturer (country) of materials consumed in this study in materials and methods section.
Response: It has been corrected.
Comment: Pleases discuss more on significant data extracted from present study in discussion section.
Response: Thank you. It has been corrected.

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)** 11 Oct 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.