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 "**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:

Peer Review

International Journal of Infection
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/iji-121894
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 9(2) ; e121894

Peer Review Report for "Review of Molecular Approaches in Leishmaniasis Vaccines: Implications and Restrictions"

Author(s): Ail Fattahi Bafghi , Elham Rezaee, Somayeh Ahmadi, Mostafa Gholamrezaei, nima firouzeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Jan 2022
Revised Date:	14 Mar 2022
Accepted Date:	16 Apr 2022

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

11 Jan 2022

Dear AE

This article is not in the form of a review article. You should cite the source of the research.
In this article discussion section is not mentioned. Authors should compare previous articles, and the protection of each vaccine should be introduced. In this article, only the introduction section is well expressed. The other approaches are mostly in the introduction, and no comparisons have been made to the approaches. This article is generally incomplete and needs to be re-edited.
Kind regards

REFEREE : Reviewer 17 Jan 2022

Dear AE
The manuscript is accepted.
Best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer 29 Jan 2022

Dear AE
Recommended comments include:

1- Add the word review " in the title of the manuscript
2- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction
3- The keywords are taken from the title and abstract. There is no trace of the word in the abstract and title in the text
Choose the keywords carefully
4- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction
5- It is better to present molecular approaches in a table in the literature review with all study characteristics, so that the reader can get molecular methods at a glance

6- The literature review focuses more on immunogenicity
7- There is no discussion of the study
8- Gaps in the studies are not mentioned
best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer 20 Feb 2022

Dear AE
Recommended comments include:
1. Scientific names should be written in italic (for example, Leishmania).
2. The manuscript should be rechecked for literary writing.
3. The article references do not conform to the journal format and are not written correctly.
4. This review article does not use new references. As the articles are mainly referenced until 2016. From 2017 to 2020, only two references and from 2021, only one article have been mentioned.
5. Numerous published studies could be evaluated in this review article, for example, articles such as:
a) Immunogenicity and protection effects of cationic liposome containing imiquimod adjuvant on leishmaniasis in BALB/c mice (2019).
b) Liposomes containing the imiquimod adjuvant as a vaccine in the cutaneous leishmaniasis model (2020).
c) Protection induced by Leishmania Major antigens and the imiquimod adjuvant encapsulated on liposomes in experimental cutaneous leishmaniasis (2019).

d) Leishmania Vaccines Entered in Clinical Trials: A Review of Literature (2019)
6. Figure 2 lacks a clear explanation.
7. In these circumstances, this article is not considered a review article.
best regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor

21 Feb 2022

Dear EIC
Recommended comments include. Please ask the author to correct all comments.

Reviewer1:
1- In the title of the manuscript, add a review word.
2- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction.
3- Keywords are taken from the title and summary. There is no trace of the word in the body in the summary. Choose your keywords carefully.
4- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction.
5- It is better to review the texts of molecular approaches in a table with all the characteristics of the study so that the reader can reach molecular methods at a glance.
6- The study of texts focuses more on immunogenicity.
7- There is no discussion of the study.
8- Study chats are not mentioned.

Reviewer2:
1. Scientific names should be written in italic (for example, Leishmania).
2. The manuscript should be rechecked for literary writing.
3. The article references do not conform to the journal format and are not written correctly.
4. This review article does not use new references. As the articles are mainly referenced until 2016. From 2017 to 2020, only two references and from 2021, only one article have been mentioned.
5. Numerous published studies could be evaluated in this review article, for example, articles such as:
a) Immunogenicity and protection effects of cationic liposome containing imiquimod adjuvant on leishmaniasis in BALB/c mice (2019).
b) Liposomes containing the imiquimod adjuvant as a vaccine in the cutaneous leishmaniasis model (2020).
c) Protection induced by Leishmania Major antigens and the imiquimod adjuvant encapsulated on liposomes in experimental cutaneous leishmaniasis (2019).
d) Leishmania Vaccines Entered in Clinical Trials: A Review of Literature (2019)
6. Figure 2 lacks a clear explanation.
7. In these circumstances, this article is not considered a review article.

Reviewer3:

This article is not in the form of a review article. You should mention the source of the research.
In this article discussion section is not mentioned. Authors should compare previous articles, and the protection of each vaccine should be introduced. In this article, only the introduction section is well expressed. The other approaches are mostly in the introduction, and no comparisons have been made to the approaches. This article is generally incomplete and needs to be re-edited
best regards

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC

21 Feb 2022

Dear Author
Please revise your manuscript based on reviewers' comments.

Reviewer1:
1- In the title of the manuscript, add a review word.
2- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction.
3- Keywords are taken from the title and summary. There is no trace of the word in the body in the summary. Choose your keywords carefully.
4- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction.
5- It is better to review the texts of molecular approaches in a table with all the characteristics of the study so that the reader can reach molecular methods at a glance.
6- The study of texts focuses more on immunogenicity.
7- There is no discussion of the study.
8- Study chats are not mentioned.

Reviewer2:
1. Scientific names should be written in italic (for example, Leishmania).
2. The manuscript should be rechecked for literary writing.
3. The article references do not conform to the journal format and are not written correctly.
4. This review article does not use new references. As the articles are mainly referenced until 2016. From 2017 to 2020, only two references and from 2021, only one article have been mentioned.
5. Numerous published studies could be evaluated in this review article, for example, articles such as:
a) Immunogenicity and protection effects of cationic liposome containing imiquimod adjuvant on leishmaniasis in BALB/c mice (2019).
b) Liposomes containing the imiquimod adjuvant as a vaccine in the cutaneous leishmaniasis model (2020).
c) Protection induced by Leishmania Major antigens and the imiquimod adjuvant encapsulated on liposomes in experimental cutaneous leishmaniasis (2019).
d) Leishmania Vaccines Entered in Clinical Trials: A Review of Literature (2019)
6. Figure 2 lacks a clear explanation.

7. In these circumstances, this article is not considered a review article.

Reviewer3:

This article is not in the form of a review article. You should mention the source of the research.
In this article discussion section is not mentioned. Authors should compare previous articles, and the protection of each vaccine should be introduced. In this article, only the introduction section is well expressed. The other approaches are mostly in the introduction, and no comparisons have been made to the approaches. This article is generally incomplete and needs to be re-edited
Best regards
EIC

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 Prof Dr. **Mohammad Naderi**

Editor-in-Chief, journal of International Journal of Infection

Many thanks for reviewing our manuscript titled "**Molecular approaches in Leishmaniasis vaccines: Implications and restrictions**". Please find the authors responses as follows.

All the reviewers' comments are considered and the manuscript is modified accordingly. Please find the point-by-point modifications below. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript.

Thank you and best regards
NF and M Gh, the corresponding authors

Reviewer 1:

1.this article is not in a form of a review article. you should mention the source of research.

Thank you for your kind remarks. As you know this manuscript is a review article, not a meta-analysis or systematic review; in this regard, we use several floating databases. Additionally, even we consider that our manuscript considers as a systematic review, based on journal guideline manuscript preparation providing the research source is unallowed. We are kindly asking please check previously published papers in this journal like review articles (doi: 10.5812/iji.109546).

2. in this article discussion section is not mentioned.

We do agree with your comment but according to journal instruction adding the discussion section to the manuscript was not recommended. Could you check previously published papers in this journal like : (doi: 10.5812/iji.109546).

3. authors should compare previous articles and protection of each vaccine should be introduced.

Dear reviewer, we think we do our best to compare all aspects of vaccines details in the fifth column of Table 1.

4. this article, only the introduction section is well expressed. The other approaches are mostly in the introduction and no comparisons have been made to the approaches. This article is generally incomplete and needs to be re-edited

We provide table 1 in this manuscript that contains main data regarding important features of vaccines like Species of Leishmania, type of vaccine, Stage of study, and level of protection. So, I'm kindly asking please check it again.

Reviewer 2:

1. the manuscript is accept

Thank you for your consideration

Reviewer 3:

1- In the title of the manuscript, add a review word.

Amended. This word was added to the manuscript. (Line 1-2) (Review of Molecular approaches in Leishmaniasis vaccines: Implications and restrictions)

2- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction.

Amended. A New sentence encompassing the purpose statement was added to the manuscript (Line 72-74). (This study was conducted to reveal vaccine progressions and their defects for finding effective solutions against leishmaniasis.)

3- Keywords are taken from the title and summary. There is no trace of the word in the body in the summary. Choose your keywords carefully.

Many thanks for your valuable comment. Proposed changes were performed (line 36). (Vaccine, Molecular, *Leishmania spp*, Antigens, Leishmaniasis.)

4- The purpose of the study is not stated in the introduction.

Amended. A New sentence encompassing the purpose statement was added to the manuscript (Line 72-74). (This study was conducted to reveal vaccine progressions and their defects for finding effective solutions against leishmaniasis.)

5- It is better to review the texts of molecular approaches in a table with all the characteristics of the study so that the reader can reach molecular methods at a glance.

Dear reviewer, we had provided a table (table 1) in the manuscript !!!!! that provide not only molecular approaches data but also further details about vaccines features: In this regard, we think we did our best and readers will reach needed information as easily as possible at a glance.

6- The study of texts focuses more on immunogenicity.

However, focusing on the immunogenicity concept is the most important target in this manuscript, we discussed several aspects of vaccines like the molecular approaches that are visible in the text body of our paper.

7- There is no discussion of study.

We do agree with your comment but according to journal instruction adding the discussion section to the manuscript was not recommended. Could you check previously published papers in this journal like : (doi: 10.5812/iji.109546).

8- Study chats are not mentioned.

Thanks for your valuable comment. Please consider that we had provided a paragraph that correctly pointed out the study gap \ challenges (Line 76-81)

Reviewer 4:

1. Scientific names should be written in italic (for example Leishmania).

Amended. The entire document for typographical errors and any other necessary corrections were checked and highlighted in the manuscript.

2. The manuscript should be re-checked for literary writing.

Amended

3. The article references do not conform to the journal format and are not written correctly.

Dear reviewer, we use Mendeley Software to reference style preparation based on journal format. Nevertheless, all of the references were rechecked and appropriate style inserted.

4. This review article does not use new references. As the articles are mainly referenced until 2016. From 2017 to 2020, only two references and from 2021 only one article has been mentioned.

Thanks, the proposed reference is cited and appropriate statements are added to the manuscript.

5. Numerous published studies could be evaluated in this review article, for example articles such as: (Line 173-174)

a) Immunogenicity and protection effects of cationic liposome containing imiquimod adjuvant on leishmaniasis in BALB/c mice (2019).

The new reference was added (Ref. 53) (Line 173-174)

b) Liposomes containing the imiquimod adjuvant as a vaccine in the cutaneous leishmaniasis model (2020).

The new reference was added (Ref. 54) (Line 173-174)

c) Protection induced by Leishmania Major antigens and the imiquimod adjuvant encapsulated on liposomes in experimental cutaneous leishmaniasis (2019).

The new reference was added (Ref. 55) (Line 173-174)

d) Leishmania Vaccines Entered in Clinical Trials: A Review of Literature (2019)

The new reference was Added (Ref. 6) (line 61).

6. Figure 2 lacks a clear explanation.

The statement was modified according to the reviewer's comments (Line 463-465)

7. In these circumstances, this article is not considered a review article.

You have raised an important point here. However, we believe that our manuscript was prepared based on journal guidelines and could be more appropriate if specify the reasons for your comment. We waiting to receive your valuable feedback respectfully and ensure that all of your insightful comments will be performed.

We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable comments on our manuscript.

Best wishes.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 16 Mar 2022

Dear AE
Most comments have been answered and corrected.
Best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 9 Apr 2022

Dear AE
Thanks to the esteemed authors for making the corrections mentioned in the article.
Best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 16 Apr 2022

Dear AE
The manuscript is approved and can be accepted and published.
Best regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 16 Apr 2022

Dear EIC

Based on reviewers' comments, the manuscript has been accepted for publication in the International Journal of Infection.
Best regards

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC — 16 Apr 2022

Dear Author
Congratulations
Hereby, we announce that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the International Journal of Infection. The manuscript will be available online in future issues.
Wish you all the best
EIC
Dr.Hamidreza Kouhpayeh