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.116795
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 8(4); e116795

Peer Review Report for "Epidemiology and Clinical Outcomes of Patients with Confirmed Influenza in Mashhad, Iran in 2019"

Author(s): Ashraf Tavanaee-Sani, Roshanak Sharifi, Zahra Nehbandani, Mohammad-Hasan Masoudi, Yasaman Solouki

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Jun 2021
Revised Date: 25 Sep 2021
Accepted Date: 28 Sep 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)

22 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
This is a retrospective article and review of the patient files. The authors have described the prevalence of influenza in patients with flu-like symptoms.
I suggest that the following be corrected.
1- Shorten the title of the article.
2- About the date of the article, unity should be done. The same date should be given throughout the article. (2018 or 2019?)
3- The abstract section of the article should be shorter, especially the results section.
4- Specify the risk factors to be examined.
5- Edit in English.
6- In the introduction, a few sentences should be added about the prevalence of influenza in Iran.
7- In which three areas of Mashhad were these diseases more common?
8- In the results section of the article, the frequency of various risk factors should be mentioned.
9- Is there a significant difference between the two sexes?
10- In the discussion section, reference number 34 has been discussed a lot. While a job as

a risk factor is not discussed in the present study, let it be summarized.
11- In the discussion section, In the final sentences, there is no need to describe the fact that Mashhad is in the northeast of Iran. Please delete it.
12- If the difference between men and women is not significant, it should be removed from the conclusion.
13- Reference No. 8 should be corrected.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
This is an interesting study about "Description of definitive cases of Influenza and Clinical outcome Among Patients referred to National Surveillance System for Influenza in Mashhad in the year 2019"
The article needs some minor revision
- In the abstract and the results, the number of patients with risk factors who died should be mentioned before the percentage (33.33%).
- Please add the number and percentage of the patients with influenza in district 3 of the municipality in Mashhad.
- A good edition is necessary for the publication.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Aug 2021

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) 14 Aug 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 (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:

Thank you so much. I have revised the paper according to reviewer's recommendation:

Reviewer 1:

Q-In the abstract and the results, the number of patients with risk factors who died should be mentioned before the percentage (33.33%).

R: The result section revised.

Death was happened in 29 patients (35.36%) and (33.33%) 3 patients with risk factors died.

Q- Please add the number and percentage of the patients with influenza in the district 3 of municipality in Mashhad.

R: The most number of influenza patients (31 cases) had been reported from district No.3 of municipality in Mashhad, which is a crowded place and near the holy shrine.

Reviewer 2:

Q- Shorten the title of the article.

R: Title is revised.

Q- About the date of the article, unity should be done. The same date should be given throughout the article. (2018 or 2019?)

R: Date of study corrected.

Q: The abstract section of the article should be shorter, especially the results section.

R: -Results in abstract section revised

Q- Specify the risk factors to be examined.

R: Risk factors have been written in objective section.

Q- Edit in English.

R: English edition is done

Q- In the introduction, a few sentences should be added about the prevalence of influenza in Iran.

R: A few sentences about prevalence added to introduction section.

Q: In which three areas of Mashhad was this disease more common?

R-City of Mashhad is divided to 13 districts and the holy shrine located in district 3 Where is a crowded place and the prevalence of Influenza was higher.

Q: In the results section of the article, the frequency of various risk factors should be mentioned

R-Frequency of risk factors is added to result section.

Q: Is there a significant difference between the two sexes?

R- There was no any significant difference between the sex

Q: In the discussion section, reference number 34 has been discussed a lot. While job as a risk factor is not discussed in the present study, let it be summarized.

R- Data about the reference number 34 has been summarized.

Q: In the discussion section, In the final sentences, there is no need to describe the fact that Mashhad is in the northeast of Iran. Please delete it.

R-Words including (North-east of Iran) are deleted

Q: If the difference between men and women is not significant, it should be removed from the conclusion.

R-So, there was no significant difference between sex, it is removed from conclusion section

Q: Reference No. 8 should be corrected.

R-Reference No.8 is corrected

Thank you

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) 29 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
Please the authors add and highlight the corrected numbers mentioned in your reviewer's answer and then the percentages in the bracket, respectively into the abstract and the text. For example, 29 (35.36%) of the patients died.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
The author has modified the items. I think this article is acceptable.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Sep 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** (1) 4 Sep 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 (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.

Dear Editor in Chief:

I have revised the paper according to reviewer's recommendation (Revision 2). Correction is green highlighted.

Q-In the abstract and the results, the number of patients with risk factors who died should be mentioned before the percentage (33.33%).

R: Death was happened in 29 patients (35.36%) and three patients (33.33%) with risk factors, died.

Q- Please add the number and percentage of the patients with influenza in the district 3 of municipality in Mashhad.

R: The most numbers of patients with influenza (31cases;37.8%) had been reported from district 3 of municipality in Mashhad, which is a crowded place and near the holy shrine.

Thank you

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) 17 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
The authors have corrected the article based on the reviewers' comments and the desired corrections have been applied.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 18 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
"Death was happened" should be changed by "death happened" in the article.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 22 Sep 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) 22 Sep 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.

Dear Editor in Chief:

I have revised the paper according to reviewer's recommendation (Revision 3). Correction is blue highlighted.

Reviewer 1:
The authors have corrected the article based on the reviewers comments and the desired corrections have been applied.
Reviewer 2:

Q-"Death was happened" should be changed by "death happened" in the article.

R: Death happened in 29 patients (35.36%) and three patients (33.33%) with risk factors, died.

Thank you

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) 26 Sep 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) 28 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
The article has been accepted into the International Journal of Infection and will be published in future issues.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (3) 28 Sep 2021

Dear author
Your article has been accepted into the International Journal of Infection and will be published in future issues.
Thanks.