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.114498
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 8(3); e114498

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of the Antimicrobial Activity of Olive and Rosemary Leave Extracts Prepared with Different Solvents Against Antibiotic-Resistant *Escherichia coli*"

Author(s): Bahman Fazeli-Nasab, Moharam Valizadeh, Mohammad Amir Hassanzadeh, Maryam Beigomi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Mar 2021
Revised Date: 19 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 20 Apr 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) — 1 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. The fourth paragraph in the introduction part should be revised.
2. Lines 43 and 44 must be revised.
3. In some parts (For example, abstract) it is mentioned that the olive plant has been used and in some other parts the olive leaf has been used . this case should be the same in the whole text.
4. The method of bacteria collection from quail fecal should be explained in the material and methods section .
5. The materials section has writing flaws that need to be corrected.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 3 Apr 2021

Dear AE,

This manuscript was completely studied, It seems it can be considered as a short paper, also there are some comments to exert.
1) Please explain how commercial antibiotics were applied in this study.
2) In table1, please explain about S, I, and R.
3) In Tables 2 and 3, each bacterial code belongs to what kind of bacteria.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
Comments for the authors:
1. The fourth paragraph in the introduction part should be revised.
2. Lines 43 and 44 must be revised.
3. In some parts (For example, abstract) it is mentioned that the olive plant has been used and in some other parts the olive leaf has been used . this case should be the same in the whole text.
4. the method of bacteria collection from quail fecal should be explained in the material and methods section .
5. The materials section has writing flaws that need to be corrected.
This manuscript was completely studied, It seems it can be considered as a short paper, also there are some comments to exert.
1) Please explain how commercial antibiotics were applied in this study.
2) In table1, please explain about S, I and R.
3) In table 2 and 3, each bacterial code belongs to what kind of bacteria.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,
1. The fourth paragraph in the introduction part should be revised.
2. Lines 43 and 44 must be revised.
3. In some parts (For example, abstract) it is mentioned that the olive plant has been used and in some other parts the olive leaf has been used . this case should be the same in the whole text.
4. the method of bacteria collection from quail fecal should be explained in the material and methods section .
5. The materials section has writing flaws that need to be corrected.
This manuscript was completely studied, It seems it can be considered as a short paper, also there are some comments to exert.
Reviewer2:
1)Please explain how commercial antibiotics were applied in this study.
2)In table1, please explain about S, I and R.
3) In table 2 and 3, each bacterial code belongs to what kind of bacteria.
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 editor in chief of the International Journal of Infection

Thanks for reviewing of our article

The article was revised based on the reviewer's comments and the revised texts were highlighted by yellow color and are listed in the article text

Reviewer 1:

1) Please explain how commercial antibiotics were applied in this study.

The antibiotics that were used in this research ere explained

2) In table1, please explain about S, I and R.

S, I and R; were explained

3) In table 2 and 3, each bacterial code belongs to what kind of bacteria.

Each bacterial code was explained and highlighted in the article text

The identification of the isolated bacterial strains were explained

Reviewer 2:

1. The fourth paragraph in the introduction part should be revised.

This section was revised

2. Lines 43 and 44 must be revised.

These sections were revised

3. In some parts (For example, abstract) it is mentioned that the olive plant has been used and in some other parts the olive leaf has been used. This case should be the same in the whole text.

The olive section that was used in this research was leaf that revised

The plant explants that were used to experiment was add in the material and methods section and also in the abstract

4. The method of bacteria collection from quail fecal should be explained in the material and methods section.

Some paragraphs that the reviewers suggested revising were revised

5. The materials section has writing flaws that need to be corrected.

The title was revised

Best

Authors

2021-04-10

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) 19 Apr 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) 20 Apr 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) 20 Apr 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) 20 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,
New version of this article seems to be acceptable for publication.
Thanks.