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.110731
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 8(1); e110731

Peer Review Report for "Seroprevalence of Q Fever in Lorestan Province Veterinary Staff Using IFA Method"

Author(s): Zahra Soleimani, Amin Jaydari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 17 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 23 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
1- The text of the article should be read carefully again and some grammatical and punctuation errors should be corrected
2- The type of study should be mentioned in the abstract of the article
3- The names of the genus and species of bacteria should be italicized in the whole text
4- What was the reason for choosing the immunofluorescence method?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- It should be mentioned what, which titer was chosen for the test?
2- In the background section, there is no association with reference number 11 and text, it should be corrected.
3- language of the manuscript should be edited by an expert editor.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Nov 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 minor revision.
Kind regards,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Nov 2020

Dear Authors,
It should be mentioned what, which titer was chosen for the test?
2- In the background section, there is no association with reference number 11 and text, it should be corrected.
3- the language of the manuscript should be edited by an expert editor
1- The text of the article should be read carefully again and some grammatical and punctuation errors should be corrected
2- The type of study should be mentioned in the abstract of the article
3- The names of the genus and species of bacteria should be italicized in the whole text
4- What was the reason for choosing the immunofluorescence method
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.

Reviewer 1:

1- It should be mentioned what, which titer was chosen for the test?

In this study Ninty two sera were tested for the presence of IgG antibodies against *C. burnetii* phase II using an indirect IFA test commercial kit (I+II IFA IgG, Vircell, Grenade, Spain). Seropositivity for *C. burnetii* antibodies was defined by a phase 2 IgG titer ≥1.256.

2- In the background section, there is no association with reference number 11 and text, it should be corrected.

Done

3- language of the manuscript should be edited by an expert editor.

Done

Reviewer 2:

1- The text of the article should be read carefully again and some grammatical and punctuation errors should be corrected

Done

2- The type of study should be mentioned in the abstract of the article

This cross-sectional study was conducted from April to July 2019 on 92 samples collected randomly from Lorestan veterinary staff.

3- The names of the genus and species of bacteria should be italicized in the whole text

Done

4- What was the reason for choosing the immunofluorescence method?

Serological methods are usually preferable to other methods in epidemiological studies. Indirect immunofluorescence (IFA) is a sensitive, practical and easy method with relatively good properties and has been identified as a reference method for this disease

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) 18 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Based on the changes made in the new version of this article, I think this article is ready to be published in this journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Nov 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) 23 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) 23 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.