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.110411
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 8(3); e110411

Peer Review Report for "Once a Known Veterinary Pathogen, Now a Forgotten Zoonosis. Case Report of An Invasive *Staphylococcus intermedius* Group Infection"

Author(s): Lucia Ines Ubiergo, Maximiliano Gabriel Castro

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 7 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 30 Mar 2021

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) — 12 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
1) Language of the manuscript is difficult to follow, it needs to be more fluent by an editor
2) the First paragraph of the discussion is similar to the introduction, it is better to be substituted by more useful sentences.
3) Title of the table has been missed please add it.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Is the method of detecting bacteria not well described in the manuscript? Biochemical test, culture, molecular test.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 1 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,

Is the method of detecting bacteria not well described in the manuscript? Biochemical test, culture, molecular test.

1) Language of the manuscript is difficult to follow, it needs to be more fluent by an editor

2) The First paragraph of the discussion is similar to the introduction, it is better to be substituted by more useful sentences.

3) Title of the table has been missed please add it.

Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,

Is the method of detecting bacteria not well described in the manuscript? Biochemical test, culture, molecular test.

1) Language of the manuscript is difficult to follow, it needs to be more fluent by an editor

2) the First paragraph of the discussion is similar to the introduction, it is better to be substituted by more useful sentences.

3) Title of the table has been missed please add it.

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.

March 5th, 2021

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

I appreciate your useful input. I hereby resubmit my revised manuscript with the main changes highlighted. Regarding the reviewers' comments, I answer them below.

- *Is the method of detecting bacteria not well described in the manuscript? Biochemical test, culture, molecular test.*

Answer: I have included in the manuscript the description of the techniques used for microbial identification. Blood cultures were drawn and put into blood culture bottles provided by the Bact/ALERT (bioMérieux, US) manufacturer and incubated in such system. After positivity, both blood cultures and, later on, mini-bronchoalveolar lavage fluid samples were put into blood agar plates and Gram stain permitted the identification of Gram-positive Staphylococci. Final microbial identification was permitted by the Vitek 2 Compact (bioMérieux, US) identification and antibiotic susceptibility testing system. These results were manually confirmed by a positive Pyrrolidonyl arylamidase enzyme (PYR) test, a positive O-Nitrophenyl-β-D-Galactopyranoside (ONPG) test and a negative Voges-Proskauer test. Oxacillin disk diffusion tests were used to prove methicillin-resistance.

1) Language of the manuscript is difficult to follow, it needs to be more fluent by an editor.

Answer: The manuscript has been reviewed by an English editor and the main changes highlighted.

2) First paragraph of the discussion is similar to introduction, it is better to be substituted by a more useful sentences.

Answer: According to this suggestion, most sentences from the first paragraph of the discussion have been substituted.

3)- Title of the table has been missed please add it.

Answer: Done.

Yours sincerely,

Corresponding author.

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) — 8 Mar 2021

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 16 Mar 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** (1) — 30 Mar 2021

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

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 30 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,
The current version is acceptable.
Thanks.