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.108247
Published in: International Journal of Infection: In Press(In Press); e108247

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Drug Resistance Before and After Biofilm Formation of Bacteria Causing Wound Infection and Detection of Their Protease Activity"

Author(s): Tasnuba Tabassum Proma, Tasnia Ahmed

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 30 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 2 Feb 2021

Revision (0)

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

Ali Mehrabi Tavana: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- You have mentioned Tables 4, 5, etc, But you have labeled Table 04, 05 which one is correct?
2- Explain how biofilm formation could be prevented?
3- Up-date your article by using very new references in both the introduction and discussion sections.
4- Write a paragraph regard to your work for the public in order to prevent biofilm formation and antibiotics resistance.
Thanks.

Mehdi Azami: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 30 Nov 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,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Dec 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.

Answers to the reviewer's suggestion:

1. The numbering of the tables have been corrected. The actual format is like Table 1, 2, 3 instead of Table 01, 02, 03. Now this issue has been resolved.

2. Prevention of biofilm for wound infection have been added in the discussion section.

3. Old references have been replaced with updated versions.

4. General information regarding preventing biofilm formation and antibiotic resistance have been added in the discussion section.

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) — 28 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Just make it clear in Tables as Key A:...k;.....
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 12 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The authors modified all parts of the manuscript which the reviewers mention and added some new information as well. this version of the manuscript is appropriate for acceptance.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 18 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Just the authors should make it clear in Tables as Key A:...k;.....
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 18 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,
Just make it clear in Tables as Key A:...k;.....
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.

Answers to the reviewer's suggestion:

1. In the table of the biochemical result, a note has been added at the end of the table stating the full form of A and K.

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) 24 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Edit your article (i.e spp in true Spp not true etc.
2- Check the exact and correct name of bacteria (Burkholderia cepcia, not correct, use the correct name (Burkholderia cepacia, etc.
3- Use at least 2-3 very new references too.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 26 Jan 2021

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,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (2) 26 Jan 2021

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.

Answers to the reviewer's suggestion:

1. The typo error 'Spp' has now been corrected as 'spp.'

2. Spelling of Burkholderia cepacia has been corrected.

3. Two recent references have been added in the discussion section and the list of reference has been updated accordingly.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 31 Jan 2021

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** (3) 2 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The version of the manuscript is appropriate for acceptance.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (3) 2 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.