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-122019
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 9(2) ; e122019

Peer Review Report for "Microsatellite Signature of Reference Genome Sequence of SARS-CoV-2 and 32 Species of *Coronaviridae* Family"

Author(s): Rezwanuzzaman Laskar, Md Gulam Gulam Jilani, Taslima Nasrin, Safdar Ali

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	20 Dec 2021
Revised Date:	16 Apr 2022
Accepted Date:	16 May 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

28 Jan 2022

Dear AE
The study is valuable. The writing of the manuscript is also well done. The following suggestions are made to strengthen the article.
1. The text of the manuscript is too long. If possible, reduce the number of words in unnecessary sections.
2. It is suggested that the title of the manuscript be changed to "Microsatellite signature of reference genome sequence of SARS-CoV-2 and 32 species of Coronaviridae family" at your discretion.
3. Due to the large number of acronyms, it is recommended that these terms be included in a table with descriptions.

4. In the discussion, if there are similar studies (confirmatory or contradictory), compare the results with those studies.
5. Unlike other sections, the conclusion is not well written. This section should state the final message of the study based on the results obtained and discussed. Rewrite this section.
6. In the image legends, first give a general title. Then, list their parts.
7. Unfortunately, the imported images are untitled, and it is confusing to find images related to the relevant legends. Imported images must have a number like "Figure 1, 2,...".
8. The caption of the image should be such that it conveys the desired content without referring to the text. Also, it is better to explain the details in the pictures more to better understand the image.
Best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer

1 Mar 2022

Dear AE
The paper needs modification according to the following comments:
- The Objectives of the study are different in the main text and the abstract section. Please write something similar, highlighting the purpose of the study in the abstract section.
- The following sentence is not clear:
“Sequence similarity therein was reaffirmed through a heat map.”
- The conclusions are supported by their data; however, the article is not focused and needs much work to improve it.
- In the Material and Methods section-Paragraph “Statistical analysis”- It is not clear on which data the kind of statistical analysis has been applied, please specify and add at the end of the Material and Methods.
- The phylogenetic tree should be rooted and use an outgroup.
- References are not as per the instructions provided by the journal.
- The strengths and limitations of the study should be described.
- Review spaces and grammar throughout the manuscript. Many spacing or typo errors that should be corrected, as well as some English corrections.
Best regards.

REFEREE : Reviewer

9 Mar 2022

Dear AE
This is a good article.
It is recommended to accept it.
In some cases, there are grammatical problems that are recommended to be fixed.
The authors are asked to prepare the process of this study as a protocol in Persian and send it to me in the next review.
Best regards.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

12 Mar 2022

Dear EIC
Please ask the author to correct the following comments
Reviewer 1:
The study done is valuable. The writing of the manuscript is also well done. The following suggestions are made to strengthen the article.
1. The text of the manuscript is too long. If possible, reduce the number of words in unnecessary sections.
2. It is suggested that the title of the manuscript be changed to "Microsatellite signature of reference genome sequence of SARS-CoV-2 and 32 species of Coronaviridae family" at your discretion.
3. Due to the large number of acronyms, it is recommended that these terms be included in a table with descriptions.
4. In the discussion, if there are similar studies (confirmatory or contradictory), compare the results with those studies.
5. Unlike other sections, the conclusion is not well written. This section should state the final message of the study based on the results obtained and discussed. Rewrite this section.
6. In the image legends, first give a general title. Then, list their parts.
7. Unfortunately, the imported images are untitled, and it is confusing to find images related to the relevant legends. Imported images must have a number like "Figure 1, 2,...".
8. The caption of the image should be such that it conveys the desired content without referring to the text. Also, it is better to explain the details in the pictures more to better understand the image.

Reviewer 2:
The paper needs modification according to the following comments:
- The Objectives of the study are different in the main text and the abstract section. Please write something similar, highlighting the purpose of the study in the abstract section.
- The following sentence is not clear:
“Sequence similarity therein was reaffirmed through a heat map.”
- The conclusions are supported by their data; however, the article is not focused and needs much work to improve it.
- In the Material and Methods section-Paragraph “Statistical analysis”- It is not clear on which data the kind of statistical analysis has been applied, please specify and add at the end of the material and methods.
- The phylogenetic tree should be rooted and use an outgroup.
- References are not as per the instructions provided by the journal.
- The strengths and limitations of the study should be described.
- Review spaces and grammar throughout the manuscript. Many spacing or typo errors that should be corrected, as well as some English corrections.

Reviewer 3:

This is a good article. It is recommended to accept it. In some cases, there are grammatical problems that are recommended to be fixed.
The authors are asked to prepare the process of this study as a protocol in Persian and send it to me in the next review.
Best regards

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC

12 Mar 2022

Dear Author
Please correct the following comments
Reviewer 1:
The study done is valuable. The writing of the manuscript is also well done. The following suggestions are made to strengthen the article.
1. The text of the manuscript is too long. If possible, reduce the number of words in unnecessary sections.
2. It is suggested that the title of the manuscript be changed to "Microsatellite signature of reference genome sequence of SARS-CoV-2 and 32 species of Coronaviridae family" at your discretion.
3. Due to the large number of acronyms, it is recommended that these terms be included in a table with descriptions.
4. In the discussion, if there are similar studies (confirmatory or contradictory), compare the results with those studies.
5. Unlike other sections, the conclusion is not well written. This section should state the final message of the study based on the results obtained and discussed. Rewrite this section.
6. In the image legends, first give a general title. Then, list their parts.
7. Unfortunately, the imported images are untitled, and it is confusing to find images related to the relevant legends. Imported images must have a number like "Figure 1, 2,...".
8. The caption of the image should be such that it conveys the desired content without referring to the text. Also, it is better to explain the details in the pictures more to better understand the image.

Reviewer 2:
The paper needs modification according to the following comments:
- The Objectives of the study are different in the main text and the abstract section. Please write something similar, highlighting the purpose of the study in the abstract section.
- The following sentence is not clear:
“Sequence similarity therein was reaffirmed through a heat map.”
- The conclusions are supported by their data; however, the article is not focused and needs much work to improve it.
- In the Material and Methods section-Paragraph “Statistical analysis”- It is not clear on which data the kind of statistical analysis has been applied, please specify and add at the end of the material and methods.

- The phylogenetic tree should be rooted and use an outgroup.
- References are not as per the instructions provided by the journal.
- The strengths and limitations of the study should be described.
- Review spaces and grammar throughout the manuscript. Many spacing or typo errors that should be corrected, as well as some English corrections.

Reviewer 3:
This is a good article. It is recommended to accept it. In some cases, there are grammatical problems that are recommended to be fixed.
The authors are asked to prepare the process of this study as a protocol in Persian and send it to me in the next review.
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.

Authors Response [AR] to Reviewers Comments [RC] for Manuscript ID: 122019 entitled “Microsatellite signature of SARS-CoV-2 reference genome sequence and 32 species of family Coronaviridae”

Reviewer 1:
[RC]
The study has done is valuable. The writing of the manuscript is also well done. The following suggestions are made to strengthen the article.

[AR]
We thank the reviewers for their positive comments.

[RC]
1. The text of the manuscript is too long. If possible, reduce the number of words from unnecessary sections.

[AR]
We have tried to prune down the manuscript wherever possible but the scope was very limited.

[RC]
2. It is suggested that the title of the manuscript be changed to "Microsatellite signature of reference genome sequence of SARS-CoV-2 and 32 species of Coronaviridae family" at your discretion.

[AR]
The title has been revised as per the reviewers suggestion.

[RC]
3. Due to the large number of acronyms, it is recommended that these terms be included in a table with descriptions.

[AR]
The same has been added in the revised manuscript.

[RC]
4. In the discussion, if there are similar studies (confirmatory or contradictory), compare the results with those studies.

[AR]
Few relevant studies have been used for comparing the data in discussion and several more comparative studies have been added in the revised manuscript.

[RC]
5. Unlike other sections, the conclusion is not well written. This section should state the final message of the study based on the results obtained and discussed. Rewrite this section.

[AR]

The manuscript has been revised accordingly.

[RC]
6. In the images legends, first give a general title. Then, list their parts.

[AR]
The manuscript has been revised accordingly.

[RC]
7. Unfortunately the imported images are untitled and it is confusing to find images related to the relevant legends. Imported images must have a number like "Figure 1, 2,...".

[AR]
The manuscript has been revised accordingly.

[RC]
8. The caption of the image should be such that it conveys the desired content without referring to the text. Also, it is better to explain the details on the pictures more to better understand the image.

[AR]
The legends have been modified as suggested in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 2:
Dear Author(s)
The paper needs modification according to following comments:

[RC]
- The Objectives of the study are deferent in the main text and abstract section. Please write something similar, highlighting the purpose of the study in abstract section.

[AR]
The manuscript has been revised accordingly.

[RC]
- Following sentence is not clear:
“Sequence similarity therein was reaffirmed through heat map”

[AR]
The manuscript has been revised accordingly.
[RC]
- The conclusions are supported by their data; however, the article is not focused and needs much work to improve it.

[AR]
The manuscript has been revised to make it more focused.

[RC]
- In Material and Methods section-Paragraph “Statistical analysis”- It is not clear on which data the kind of statistical analysis has been applied, please

specify and add in the end of material and methods.

[AR]
The revised manuscript has the details added as suggested.

[RC]
- The phylogenetic tree should be rooted and used an outgroup.

[AR]
We have not used the rooted phylogenetic tree as the emergence of SARS-Cov-2 is an ongoing process and since which species has led to what cannot be said with certainty so an unrooted tree would be the best way to analyze of the ongoing genomics dynamics.

[RC]
- References are not as per the instructions provided by the journal.

[AR]
The references have been modified as per journal guidelines.

[RC]
- The strength and limitations of the study should be described.

[AR]
The same has been added in the revised manuscript.

[RC]
- Review spaces and grammar throughout the manuscript. Many spacing or typo errors which should be corrected, as well as some English corrections.

[AR]
The manuscript has been edited for spacing and typo errors.

Reviewer 3:
[RC]
This is a good article. It is recommended to accept it. In some cases, there are grammatical problems that are recommended to be fixed.

[AR]

We thank the reviewer for the positive comments.

[RC]
The authors are asked to prepare the process of this study as a protocol in Persian and send it to me in the next review.

[AR]
We have no knowledge of Persian language and hence it isn’t possible at this point of time.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 17 Apr 2022

Dear AE
The author responded to all revisions. No further changes needed.
Best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 29 Apr 2022

Dear AE
The suggested changes have been made, and the manuscript is acceptable.
Best regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 14 May 2022

Dear AE
It can be accepted.
Best regards

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 16 May 2022

Dear EIC

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

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC — 16 May 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