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.104447
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 7(3); e104447

Peer Review Report for "Comparative Evaluation of Linezolid and Teicoplanin in the Treatment of Ventilator-Associated MRSA Pneumonia: A Single-Center Experience"

Author(s): Md Jahidul Hasan, Shahzadi Sayeeda Tun Nessa, Raihan Rabbani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 May 2020
Revised Date: 6 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 13 Jun 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)

16 May 2020

Dear AE,

I have read the manuscript entitled “Comparative evaluation of linezolid and teicoplanin in the treatment of ventilator-associated MRSA pneumonia: a single-center experience ” which makes a comparative evaluation of clinical outcomes and drug safety between linezolid and teicoplanin in VAMP treatment. They said that Linezolid and teicoplanin are the potential antibiotics for VAMP treatment with close microbial eradication ability.

However, there are some points that should be commented on. In my opinion, it is better the authors follow the below points.

1. The English language of the manuscript is not sufficient and there are still grammatical errors in the entire text. Please recheck it. Camma, dots, spacing, capital letters…….

2. The size and font are not in accordance with the format of the journal.

The author should pay attention to the instruction to the authors.

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

4. Methods are not sufficient and need more information such as inclusion and exclusion criteria, demographic data.

5. In methods please explain completely in detail how to choose subjects.
6. References are not updated. More than two-thirds.
7. Figures 1 and 2 are not indexed in the text.
Kindest Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 26 May 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript was completely revised and some comments are presented as follows:
1) the language of the manuscript is too difficult to understand, it needs to be fluent.
2) please use the same pattern for your tables.
3) I think this manuscript has not been able to clarify its aim, your aim was (to choose the better one from these two antibiotics, linezolid or teicoplanin in VAMP treatment.) and your conclusion was (teicoplanin may be the preferred antibiotic compared to linezolid in the treatment of ventilator-associated MRSA pneumonia.)
4) the legend of figures and titles of tables are too weak please expand them.
Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 May 2020

Dear EIC,
I have read the manuscript entitled “Comparative evaluation of linezolid and teicoplanin in the treatment of ventilator-associated MRSA pneumonia: a single-center experience ” which makes a comparative evaluation of clinical outcomes and drug safety between linezolid and teicoplanin in VAMP treatment. They said that Linezolid and teicoplanin are the potential antibiotics for VAMP treatment with close microbial eradication ability.
However, there are some points that should be commented on. In my opinion, it is better the authors follow the below points.
1. The English language of the manuscript is not sufficient and there are still grammatical errors in the entire text. Please recheck it. Camma, dots, spacing, capital letters…….
2. The size and font are not in accordance with the format of the journal.
The author should pay attention to the instruction to the authors.
3. With respect to the authors, what is the novelty of the article? It is recommended to discuss more in the introduction.
4. Methods are not sufficient and need more pieces of information such as inclusion and exclusion criteria, demographic data.
5. In methods please explain completely in detail how to choose subjects.
6. References are not updated. More than two-thirds.
7. Figures 1 and 2 are not indexed in the text.
Kindest Regards
This manuscript was completely revised and some comments are presented as follows:
1) the language of the manuscript is too difficult to understand, it needs to be fluent.
2) please use the same pattern for your tables.
3) I think this manuscript has not been able to clarify its aim, your aim was (to choose the better one from these two antibiotics, linezolid or teicoplanin in VAMP treatment.) and your conclusion was (teicoplanin may be the preferred antibiotic compared to linezolid in the treatment of ventilator-associated MRSA pneumonia.)

4) the legend of fig and titles of tables are too weak please expand them.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 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 (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.

Reply to reviewers' comments

Reviewer 01

1. The English language of the manuscript is not sufficient and there are still grammatical errors in the entire text. Please recheck it. Camma, dots, spacing, capital letters…….
   The English language of this manuscript has been revised. Grammatical errors are identified and corrected, accordingly.
2. The size and font are not in accordance with the format of the journal. The author should pay attention to the instruction to the authors.
   The entire manuscript has been revised and formatted following the "instruction to the authors" guidelines.
3. With respect to the authors, what is the novelty of the article? It is recommended to discusse more in introduction.
   The novelty of this study: a comparative study that found the clinical outcomes associated with linezolid and teicoplanin, and associated adverse drug reactions which caused withdrawal of the drug therapy and distinguished the more safe and effective antibiotic for MRSA-VAP treatment in critically ill patients.
4. Methods are not sufficient and need more information such as inclusion and exclusion criteria, -demographic data.
   Methods part of the manuscript has been revised. Sample inclusion/exclusion criteria, demographic information, and study design was included in the manuscript.
5. In methods please explain completely in details how to choose subjects.
   The sampling method (lottery method) has been described in the manuscript.
6. References are not updated. More than two-thirds.
   All the references have been updated according to journal.
7. Figures 1 and 2 are not indexed in the text.
   Figure 1 and 2 has been cited in the text.

Reviewer 02

1. the language of manuscript is too difficult to understand, it needs to be fluent.
   In many areas of the manuscript, language has been modified for better fluency.
2. please use the same pattern for your tables.
   Same pattern of the tables (two) has been followed properly.
3. I think this manuscript has not been able to clarify its aim, your aim was (to choose the better one from these two antibiotics, linezolid or teicoplanin in VAMP treatment.) and your conclusion was (teicoplanin may be the preferred antibiotic compared to linezolid in thetreatment of ventilator-associated MRSA pneumonia.)
   These sentences have been modified to clarify the aim of this study, and the manuscript has been revised, accordingly.

4. legend of fig and titles of tables are too weak please expand them.
   Both figures are modified, legends are rewritten and table formats are modified.

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) — 10 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have carried out reforms.
Best regards.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 12 Jun 2020

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

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 13 Jun 2020

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

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 Jun 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.