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.104037
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 7(4); e104037

Peer Review Report for "Frequency and Antimicrobial Susceptibility of Bacterial Agents Causing Peritoneal Dialysis-Related Peritonitis: A Two-Center Experience"

Author(s): Fariba Shirvani, Nakysa Hooman, Abdollah Karimi, Shahnaz Armin, Alireza Fahimzad, Roxana Mansour Ghanaei, Sedigheh RafieeTabatabaei, Fatemeh Fallah

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 4 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 22 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.

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 15 May 2020

Dear AE,
It's an interesting manuscript about the frequency and antimicrobial susceptibility of bacterial agents causing peritoneal dialysis-related peritonitis: a two-center experience. The manuscript is well organized but there are a few problems that authors should reform before publication.
- The first letter of the bacterial genus should be capitalized.
- Please add your inclusion criteria in the material and method section.
- It's better that you use of "case" or "patient" word instead of "episode".
- Please add the full names of the antibiotics that you used in this research.
Regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 16 May 2020

Dear AE,
The article " Frequency and Antimicrobial Susceptibility of Bacterial Agents Causing

Peritoneal dialysis-related Peritonitis: a Two-center Experience" was read and some points are given below:

1. Double-check for grammatical points is needed.
2. the manuscript is not according to the instructions of the author in the International Journal of Infection.
3. introduction is very short and incomplete. It needs more details. The main purpose of the research is unclear.
4. With respect to the authors, what is the novelty of the article? It is recommended to discuss more in the introduction.
5. It is suggested that Table 1 be shown as a pie/polar bar chart.
6. the discussion is not convincing. More accurate evaluation is needed.

Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 May 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) 16 May 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.

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for your constructive comments. The authors have made changes accordingly which are explained below. Each item is addressed seperately and underlined. Changes made to the manuscript are marked by bold font.

Response to reviewer 1

1. *The first letter of bacterial genus should be capitalized.*

   Thank you for your comment. The first letters were capitalized.

2. *Please add you your inclusion criteria in the material and method section.*

   Thank you for your comment. Done.

3. *It's better that you use of "case" or "patient" word instead of "episode" .*

   Thank you for your comment. Done.

4. *Please add full name of antibiotics that you used in this research.*

   Thank you for your comment. Done.

Response to reviewer 2

1. *Double-check for grammatical points are needed.*

   Thank you for your comment. The manuscript was thoroughly checked.

2. *The manuscript is not according to the instructions of the author in the International Journal of Infection.*

   We revised the manuscript according to the author guidelines.

3. *Introduction is very short and incomplete. It need more details. The main purpose of the research is unclear*.

The introduction was duely revised, with more explanationns and new references added.

4. *With respect to the authors, what is the novelty of the article? It is recommended to discuss more in introduction.*

Thank you for your comment. Done.

5. *It is suggested that Table 1 be shown as a pie/polar bar chart.*

Table 1 depicts the baseline characteristics of PD-related peritonitis episodes. Please explain more.

6. *The discussion is not convincing. More accurate evaluation is needed.*

The discussion was duely revised, with more explanationns and new references added.

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 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for giving me the opportunity to peer review. I have read the corrected version of the article. The authors have addressed most of the raised points, so the manuscript got better.
Best regards.

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 28 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Unfortunately, not all of the suggested comments have been considered. In some lines , the first letter of bacterial genus is small and should be written in capitalized format (line 110 and 148).
It's better that you use of "case" or "patient" word instead of "episode". You said that this was done but it was not done at all. Also, you did not add the full name of the antibiotics I asked before.
Please rechecked and reformed your manuscript and resend for review.
Regards,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 28 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
Unfortunately, not all of the suggested comments have been considered. In some lines , the first letter of bacterial genus is small and should be written in capitalized format (line 110 and 148).
It's better that you use of "case" or "patient" word instead of "episode". You said that this was done but it was not done at all. Also, you did not add the full name of the antibiotics I asked before.
The authors should recheck and reform the manuscript and resend for review.
Regards,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,
Unfortunately, not all of the suggested comments have been considered. In some lines , the first letter of bacterial genus is small and should be written in capitalized format (line 110

and 148).

It's better that you use of "case" or "patient" word instead of "episode". You said that this was done but it was not done at all. Also, you did not add the full name of the antibiotics I asked before.

Please rechecked and reformed your manuscript and resend for review.

Regards,

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:

Thankyou for your scientific review:

Reviewer1: thank you

Reviewer 2 and *Associate Editor 1:*

Unfortunately, not all of the suggested comments have been considered. In some lines , the first letter of bacterial genus is small and should be written in capitalized format (line 110 and 148).

THANK YOU THIS IS DONE
its better that you use of "case" or "patient" word instead of "episode". You said that this was done but it was not done at all. Also, you did not add the full name of the antibiotics I asked before.
Please rechecked and reformed your manuscript and resend for review.

THANK YOU THIS IS DONE, ALL ANTIBIOTICS ARE IN FULL NAME
Best Regards

F Shirvani MD

Corresponding author

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) 19 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I have read the corrected version of the article. The authors have addressed most of the raised points.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 21 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
At the present, the manuscript is rechecked and I realized the article is reformed according to reviewers comments.
Regards,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 22 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
At the present, the manuscript is rechecked and I realized the article is reformed according to reviewers comments.
Regards,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (2) 22 Oct 2020

Dear author,
At the present, the manuscript is rechecked and I realized the article is reformed according to reviewers comments.
Regards,