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 Infection
Article DOI: 10.5812/iji.101258
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 7(1); e101258

Peer Review Report for "A Rare Presentation of Fulminant Necrotizing Soft Tissue Infection in Post Partum Period: Report of Two Cases"

Author(s): Anju Kumari, Meghraj Kundan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 18 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Mar 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) — 8 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The article is an interesting presentation of two patients with fulminant necrotizing soft tissue infection in the post-partum period. The article needs some changes to be more acceptable for publication.
Changing the title to "A rare presentation of fulminant necrotizing soft tissue infection in post-partum period: report of two cases" seems more appropriate. Mentioning the results of cultures (pus or blood) and antibiogram would be helpful. For the second patient name the antibiotics which were prescribed.
More case reports should be added in the discussion as well as their references. There are some orthographic and typing errors that need to be corrected. The whole article needs another edition.
Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 16 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The article is an interesting presentation of two patients with fulminant necrotizing soft tissue infection in the post-partum period. The article needs some changes to be more

acceptable for publication.
Changing the title to "A rare presentation of fulminant necrotizing soft tissue infection in post-partum period: report of two cases" seems more appropriate. Mentioning the results of cultures (pus or blood) and antibiogram would be helpful. For the second patient name the antibiotics which were prescribed.
More case reports should be added in the discussion as well as their references. There are some orthographic and typing errors that need to be corrected. The whole article needs another edition.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 16 Mar 2020

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.

Respected sir

As EIC Decision

1. I had changed TITLE according to suggestion.
2. I had added culture and sensitivity report in 1st case and antibiotic in 2nd case,
3. I had corrected typing errors.
4. I had added one more references.

Thanking you

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) 26 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for the authors' revision. The article is accepted after a good edition.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Mar 2020

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

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