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

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/compreped.105837
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 11(4); e105837

Peer Review Report for "The Comparison of *Staphylococcus aureus* Nasal Colonization and Its Antibiotic Resistance Patterns in Children of Health Care Workers (HCWs) and Non-HCWs"

Author(s): Iraj Sedighi, Javad Faradmal, Mohammad Yousef Alikhani, Mehrnaz Olfat

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	1 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	16 Jun 2020
Accepted Date:	20 Jun 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Houman Hashemian: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
1- Because the comparison is between the children of health workers and others, it is better to mention the effect of this in the background of the abstract, not the crowded role of daycares or schools.
2. In the abstract, the main result should be mentioned, which is the difference between the prevalence of staph colonization between the two groups. It is best to include sub-results or suggestions in the text of the article.
3. Didn't you have an exclusion criterion? Not mentioned in the manuscript.
4. Explain the reason for not examining the resistance to vancomycin.
Good luck.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 13 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well-structured, well-written, and interesting to read.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Jun 2020

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Jun 2020

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
Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Thanks for your attention to our manuscript and also thank the reviewers for their worthy comments. With regards to the reviewer's comments, we correct the Manuscript '**The comparison of *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal colonization and its antibiotic resistance patterns in children of health care workers (HCWs) and non HCWs**' the suggestions offered by the reviewer have been immensely helpful.

I dedicated a number to each reviewer comment and explained exactly how we addressed each concern, below it. The revisions have been approved by all authors and I have again been chosen as the corresponding author.

Reviewer 1:

1- Because the comparison is between the children of health workers and others, it is better to mention the effect of this in the background of the abstract, not the crowded role of daycares or schools.
Regarding to reviewer's comments the background was corrected.
2. In the abstract, the main result should be mentioned, which is the difference between the prevalence of staph colonization between the two groups. It is best to include sub-results or suggestions in the text of the article.
Regarding to reviewer's comments the main result presented in the first paragraph of abstract finding and the less important finding were omitted from the abstract.
3. Didn't you have an exclusion criterion? Not mentioned in the manuscript.
The last paragraph of method is about exclusion criterion.
4. Explain the reason for not examining the resistance to vancomycin.
Our results showed one vancomycin-resistant isolate, but were not presented in the previous version of manuscript because the disc method is not definitive method for vancomycin resistance. Now regarding to reviewer's comments this point added to manuscript (table 3).

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for your efforts and kindness.

Yours Sincerely,

Mohammad yousef Alikhani ,
Microbiology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan IR, Iran
Alikhani43@yahoo.com
alikhani@umsha.ac.ir

Mehrnaz Olfat
Pediatric Department, Faculty of Medicine, Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan IR, Iran
olfat.mehrnaz@gmail.com

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) 17 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the esteemed authors of the manuscript, all the necessary corrections have been made.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Jun 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.