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

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.92807
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 8(4); e92807

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Susceptibility to Fluconazole and Voriconazole in Oral *Candida glabrata* Isolates from Drug Addicts"

Author(s): Narges Golirad, Leila Fozouni, Hamidreza Pordeli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 May 2019
Revised Date: 31 Jul 2019
Accepted Date: 26 Aug 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 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
This article with major revision could be accepted.
my points recorded in the checklist.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 19 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
1. Ethics of the study needs some attention. Oral and written consent should have been obtained from the patients before their participation in this study.
2. Ethical approval of this study also needs to be mentioned, by giving ethical code number.
3. More recent references can be included in this study, which could renovate the study.
4. Demographic information of the patients should be mentioned in the report.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 22 Jul 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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

22 Jul 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.

Replying to Reviewers

New changes highlighted in yellow.

Abstract

The keywords were revised and corrected.

Introduction

This section was completed.

Materials and Methods

Inclusion and exclusion criteria, calculation of sample size, target population and….were added.

Ethical Considerations: We were not required to have an ethical code. All the personal data such as name and address of them were confidential, and samples were identified merely with a special code. However if you recommend having one, let us know to take it into consideration and get a code.

Result

This section (text and figures) was revised and completed.

Discussion

This section was revised and corrected.

References

3 new references were added.

The whole text was reviewed and revised.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 21 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
The author please change the title of the charts from figure to chart.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Aug 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Aug 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.