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.96442
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 6(4) ; e96442

Peer Review Report for "Clinical Features and Outcomes in ESBL-Producing Microorganisms in Renal Transplant Recipients with Urinary Tract Infections"

Author(s): Joya Singh, Mikhail de Jesus, Leigh G. Cooper, Judith Pozzerle, Suresh J. Antony, Bleu Knight

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 Jul 2019
Revised Date:	17 Sep 2019
Accepted Date:	28 Sep 2019

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

27 Jul 2019

Dear associate editor
I have read the brief report entitled “Clinical Features and Outcomes in ESBL-producing Microorganisms in Renal Transplant Recipients with Urinary Tract Infections,” which analyzes the outcome of renal transplants at a tertiary care center to identify the risk factors associated with renal transplantation-associated UTIs by ESBL-producing organisms. They recommend routinely conducting genetic sequencing via PCR to identify CRE organisms while evaluating renal transplant recipients. However, there are some points that should be commented on. In my

opinion, it is better for the authors to follow the points below.
1. Abstract of the study is not according to the instructions.
2. References are not according to the instructions
3. The English language of the manuscript is sufficient; however, there are still grammatical errors in the entire text. Please recheck it. Camma, dots, spacing, capital letters.....
4. In abstract, the conclusion is not clear and needs more details.
Final decision: minor revision.
Kindest Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer 30 Jul 2019

Dear AE
The following comments are recommended.
1- Due to the trend of research, the suggestion of doing molecular work in the abstract of the article does not seem reasonable.
2- Journal Reference Format has not been regarded.
3- Where did references 19 and 20 come from?
BEST regards.

REFEREE : Associate Editor 31 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
I have read the brief report entitled “Clinical Features and Outcomes in ESBL-producing Microorganisms in Renal Transplant Recipients with Urinary Tract Infections,” which analyzes the outcome of renal transplants at a tertiary care center to identify the risk factors associated with renal transplantation-associated UTIs by ESBL-producing organisms. They recommend routinely conducting genetic sequencing via PCR to identify CRE organisms while evaluating renal transplant recipients. However, there are some points that should be commented on. In my opinion, it is better for the authors to follow the points below.
1. Abstract of the study is not according to the instructions.
2. References are not according to the instructions
3. The English language of the manuscript is sufficient; however, there are still grammatical errors in the entire text. Please recheck it. Camma, dots, spacing, capital letters.....
4. In abstract, the conclusion is not clear and needs more details.
5- Due to the trend of research, the suggestion of doing molecular work in the abstract of the article does not seem reasonable.
6- Journal Reference Format has not been regarded.
7- Where did references 19 and 20 come from?

Kindest Regards

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC

31 Jul 2019

Dear Author

Please correct the following comments in your manuscript.

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.

Please see our comments below (in black) in response to the requests made by the editors (in red).

Reviewer 1:

1. Abstract of the study is not according to the instructions.
    a. This has been updated to follow the instructions. Changes are highlighted in the manuscript.
2. References are not according to the instructions
    a. This has been updated to follow the instructions. Changes are highlighted in the manuscript.
3. The English language of the manuscript is sufficient however there are still grammatical errors in the entire text. Please recheck it. Camma, dots, spacing, capital letters.
    a. This has been updated to follow the instructions. Changes are not highlighted in the manuscript, but it has been corrected for grammatical errors.
4. In abstract, the conclusion is not clear and needs more details.
    a. The Discussion section of the manuscript contains all of the prevalent information regarding our findings. The conclusions have been edited to include more information as requested. Changes are highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

1- Due to trend of research, the suggestion of doing molecular work in the abstract of the article does not seem reasonable.
    a. Thank you for your suggestion. This has been removed and is reflected in the re-written Abstract highlighted on the manuscript.
2- Journal Reference Format has not been regarded.
    a. We followed the format for a Research Article listed by the journal. Please advise on specific changes you'd like us to make.
3- Where references 19 and 20 are came?
    a. This has been updated to follow the instructions. Changes are highlighted in the manuscript.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

1. Abstract of the study is not according to the instructions.
2. References are not according to the instructions
3. The english language of the manuscript is sufficient however there are still grammatical errors in the entire text. Please recheck it. Camma, dots, spacing, capital letters.
4. In abstract, the conclusion is not clear and needs more details.

Points 1-4 have been address above.

Peer Review Policy: Full manuscript file should not include the authors' names and affiliation.

Authors' names and affiliations have been removed from the full manuscript.

Authorship Manipulation: The order of authors on the journal website will be corrected upon resubmission.

The following corrections have been made to the original manuscript and included at the end.

- **Ethical and Legal Considerations:** This was a retrospective study that did not require any patient consent or IRB approval. All patient identifiers have been adequately removed.
- **Funding/Support:** The authors of this study have no financial interests related to the material in the manuscript. This study did not require funding. This is addressed at the end of the manuscript.
- **Informed Consent:** This was a retrospective study that did not require any patient consent or IRB approval. All patient identifiers have been adequately removed. This is addressed at the end of the paper and in the Materials and Methods section of the manuscript.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 23 Sep 2019

Dear AE
Journal Reference Format has not been regarded.

REFEREE : Reviewer — 28 Sep 2019

Dear AE
The current manuscript is about Clinical Features and Outcomes in ESBL-producing Microorganisms in Renal Transplant Recipients with Urinary Tract Infections, which analyzes the outcome of renal transplants at a tertiary care center to identify the risk factors associated with renal transplantation-associated UTIs by ESBL-producing organisms. They recommend routinely conducting genetic sequencing via PCR to identify CRE organisms while evaluating renal transplant recipients. The English language of the manuscript is sufficient. It was also well written and discussed. In addition, the authors have carried out reforms.
Best regards.

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 28 Sep 2019

Dear EIC
According to the reviewer's opinion, this article is appropriate for publication in this journal.
BEST regards.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC — 28 Sep 2019

Dear Author
This manuscript is acceptable based on the reviewer's opinion.
Best regards.
EIC