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.102929
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 7(2); e102929

Peer Review Report for "Toxoplasmosis Among HIV Patients and Healthy Volunteers in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria"

Author(s): Evelyn O Onosakponome, Austin E Abah, Michael Wogu

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 23 May 2020
Accepted Date: 30 May 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) — 6 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The framework of the article is good and can be accepted.
Thanks.

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 17 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
It's an interesting manuscript about the toxoplasmosis amongst HIV patients and healthy volunteers in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.
In the case of this article, the following items will be reviewed and revised:
- All diagrams are given in the form of a table.
- What is the meaning of the letter "E" at the end of the words "IgG and IgM" in the figures and tables?
- Why is the rate of positive cases in immunocompromised patients lower than in others?
- Why not consider other important risk factors associated with the disease, such as eating raw or undercooked meat, contact with cats, and so on?
- According to Figure 1, IgG levels appear to be significantly different between the two groups, while it seems to be quite the opposite.

Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Apr 2020

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) 18 Apr 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.

Answers to questions raised by reviewers'

1). *All diagrams are given in the form of a table-* **All diagrams are given in form of charts because the results are easier to read and interpret at a glance since lot of parameters are represented on the chart.**

2). *What is the meaning of the letter "E" at the end of the words "IgG and IgM" in the figures and tables?* **Letter E at the end of IgG and IgM stands for ELISA TEST as interpreted in the legend under figure 1**

3). *Why is the rate of positive cases in immunocompromised patients lower than in others?* **The seroprevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii* for immunocompromised subjects for IgM ELISA test was lower than that of immunocompetent subjects in this study and that was our observation and we are not sure why this is so. However,**

a). The samples were randomly collected and figures represent the results obtained in this present study.

b). IgM has repeatedly recorded low seroprevalence for HIV subjects in several studies and that may be the reason why it is usually not recommended for routine testing in these subjects.

4). *Why not consider other important risk factors associated with the disease, such as eating raw or undercooked meat, contact with cats, and so on?* **Several risk factors were considered including eating raw or undercooked meat which is locally called 'suya' and contact with pets. These were tagged "consumption of suya" and "history of owning pets" in table 1**

5). *According to Figure 1, IgG levels appear to be significantly different between the two groups, while it seems to be quite the opposite.* **The IgG Levels for the two groups are significant but the groups are not significantly different from each other in IgG Levels**

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.

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Unfortunately, I still see the previous problems.
Comments for the authors:
- Please change all diagrams to table.
- Please eliminate of "E" end of the "IgG and IgM" in the figures and tables.
Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 30 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
Unfortunately, I still see the previous problems.
The authors should change all diagrams to table. and also eliminate of "E" end of the "IgG and IgM" in the figures and tables.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 30 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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,

Please find attached the revised manuscript with the figures converted to table as insisted by the reviewer.

Thank you.

Austin

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 13 May 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 15 May 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks very much for the authors' attention to reviewers' comments. Please create data from Tables 1 to 6 in the one table.
Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 May 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 May 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

Answer to Reviewer.

Table 1-6 has been converted to One table (Table 1)

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 28 May 2020

Dear AE,
The article is reformed according to the reviewers' suggestion and it's suitable for publication.
Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 30 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The article is reformed according to reviewer suggestion and it's suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 30 May 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.