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.110423
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 8(1); e110423

Peer Review Report for "Introduction of a Novel Poly-Epitope Vaccine Against *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* Infection; an Immunoinformatics Approach"

Author(s): Ehsan Rashidian, Ali Forouharmehr, Amin Jaydari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 9 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 11 Nov 2020

Revision (0)

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

narges nazifi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 24 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I think this manuscript contains a novel construct to present, but there are some comments to do, the comments are as follows:
1) please insert alleles that have been used for prediction.
2) please do codon adaptation for an appropriate host.
3) please do in silico cloning in an appropriate vector.
4) please revise the manuscript language by an expert editor.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 28 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript “Introduction a Novel Poly-epitope Vaccine against Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Infection; an Immunoinformatics approach”.
There are a few concerns: 1- It has a minor of grammatical mistakes and typos and its English should be revised. 2- Figures 2 and 4. Is not clear and its writing is hard to read.

I suggest the authors read and revised it thoroughly.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 29 Oct 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) 29 Oct 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.

Dear reviewers

All revisions have been shown with red color in manuscript text.

Reviewer 1:
I think this manuscript contains a novel construct to present, but there are some comments to do, the comments are as follows:

1)- please insert alleles which have been used for prediction. It was done.
2)- please do codon adaptation for an appropriate host. It was done.
3)- please do in silico cloning in an appropriate vector. It was done.
4) please revise manuscript language by an expert editor. I was completely revised.

Reviewer 2:
I read the manuscript "Introduction a Novel Poly-epitope Vaccine against Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Infection; an Immunoinformatics approach".
There are a few concerns: 1- It has a minor of grammatical mistakes and typos and its English should be revised. 2- Figure 2 and 4. Is not clear and its writing is hard to read. They were clarified.

I suggest the authors read and revised it thoroughly. I was completely revised.

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.

narges nazifi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 9 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Based on the changes made in the new version of this article, I think this article is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 11 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The present research paper is looking very good. Thus, it should be accepted soon.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 11 Nov 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) — 11 Nov 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.