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.97850
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 6(4) ; e97850

Peer Review Report for "First Seroprevalence Study of *Coxiella burnetii* in Rural Pregnant Women in Contact with Livestock in Khorramabad"

Author(s): Eiman Azizyari Ghobadi, Amin Jaydari, Soheila Akbari, Khatereh Anbari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	5 Sep 2019
Revised Date:	11 Oct 2019
Accepted Date:	15 Oct 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

3 Oct 2019

Dear AE
The following comments are recommended.
1. The title needs to be changed: it's better to use "study" instead of "survey" and "seroprevalence" instead of serological
2. Given that this article is done in part of Iran and not all of Iran, it is advisable to remove "Iran" from the title as well as keywords and replace it with "Khorramabad".
3. improve the English language and also the punctuation
Kind Regards.

REFEREE : Reviewer

4 Oct 2019

Dear AE
If the comments are considered, the manuscript will be ready to publish.
1)The language of the manuscript should be corrected by an expert editor.
2) Why haven't researchers used the IFA assay instead of the ELISA assay? Please explain your reasons.
3) Please explain your sampling methods
4) It is suggested that the authors use the term " seroprevalence in the results part.
Thanks.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

5 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
Please ask the author to correct the comments.
1)The language of the manuscript should be corrected by an expert editor.
2) Why haven't researchers used the IFA assay instead of the ELISA assay? Please explain your reasons.
3)- Please explain your sampling methods
4)- It is suggested that the authors use the term " seroprevalence in the results part.
5. The title needs to be changed: it's better to use "study" instead of "survey" and "seroprevalence" instead of serological
6. Given that this article is done in part of Iran and not all of Iran, it is advisable to remove "Iran" from the title as well as keywords and replace it with "Khorramabad".
7. Improve the English language and also the punctuation.
Kind Regards.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC

5 Oct 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.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

1)The language of the manuscript should be corrected by an expert editor. **Done**

2) why haven't researchers used IFA assay instead of ELISA assy, please explain your reasons.

In preliminary epidemiological studies, the use of ELISA as a functional method without the need for expensive equipment such as fluorescence microscopy is preferable to .immunofluorescence

3)- Please explain your sampling methods This study was cross-sectional

4)- It is suggested that the authors use the term of seroprevalence in the results part. **Done**

5. The title needs to be changed: its better to use "study" instead of "survey" and "seropervalence" instead of serological

The First Seroprevalence Study on *Coxiella burnetii* in Rural Pregnant Women with Historical Contact Livestock in Khorramabad

6. Given that this article is done in part of Iran and not all of Iran, it is advisable to remove "Iran" from the title as well as keywords and replace with "Khorramabad".

The First Seroprevalence Study on *Coxiella burnetii* in Rural Pregnant Women with Historical Contact Livestock in Khorramabad

Keywords: *Coxiella burnetii*, Seroprevalence, Rural, Pregnant Women, Khorramabad

7. improve the English language and also the punctuation . **Done**

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 13 Oct 2019

Dear AE
The revised manuscript is ready to publish.
Kind Regards.

REFEREE : Reviewer — 14 Oct 2019

Dear AE
It is acceptable to publish in this Journal.
Kind Regards.

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 15 Oct 2019

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

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh : EIC — 15 Oct 2019

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