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

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.100948
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(9); e100948

Peer Review Report for "In Silico Analysis of S315T and S315R Mutations of Multidrug-resistant *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* Clinical Isolates from Karachi, Pakistan"

Author(s): Muhammad Mumtaz Khan, Maria S Alves, Sadia Alam, Mohammad H Khan, Muhammad Jahangir, Abdul Jabbar, Rehmat Zaman, Sajid Ali, Aisha Bibi, Mustafa Kamal

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 4 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 8 Nov 2020

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 | **Revision** (0) 29 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript has focused on the analysis of the S315 and S315R mutations of multidrug-resistant Mycobacterium tuberculosis clinical isolates.
The research topic is of some interest.
But:
- Language check is recommended.
- The units of measurement used in the whole manuscript would be unified.
- Please refer to other literature and revise the introduction to give a concrete background of this study
- The results section is too short.
- The discussion needs a lot more information about " Docking studies with isoniazid prodrug".
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The present manuscript could be considered for publication after major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below (Pleases find attached files). The reviewers recommend the reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. Please answer point by point to reviewer's comments on a separate sheet under WORD format and write your modifications in the revised version (WORD format) in colored or highlighted letters. Your answers to reviewers' queries are not only for the Editorial Board but for the readers and should be included, when appropriate, in the manuscript for improvement and a better understanding.
When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made a point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition, JJM INSTRUCTION attached to the mail, Pleases find it.
Note:
Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Pleases follow the below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
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.

REPLY TO THE REVIEWER COMMENTS

REVIEWER 1

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript has focused on analysis of the S315 and S315R mutations of multidrug-resistant Mycobacterium tuberculosis clinical isolates.

The research topic is some interest.
But:
Language check is recommended.

***REPLY: A full length language check is applied**.*

The units of measurement used in whole manuscript would be unified.

REPLY: Units of measurement are unified.
Please refer other literature and revise introduction to give a concrete background of this study

REPLY: Latest TB prevalence data is added in introduction.
The results section is too short.

REPLY: Results section figures are increased
The discussion needs a lot more information about " Docking studies with isoniazid prodrug"

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 8 Nov 2020

Dear Authors
According to the associated editor report, your manuscript is accepted for publishing in JJM and send to the publisher for the next process.
Note:
Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf.
Thanks.