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.105556
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(7); e105556

Peer Review Report for "Epidemiology of Acute Rotavirus Diarrhea Among Hospitalized Children Under Five Years of Age in Hefei, China, During 2015 - 2018"

Author(s): Liping Yuan, Gillian Gianna Anne Lum, Junmei Zhao, Wenya Li

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 May 2020
Revised Date: 15 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 15 Sep 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)

15 Jun 2020

Regarding the manuscript entitled" Epidemiology of acute rotavirus diarrhea among hospitalized children under 5 years of age in Hefei China during 2015-2018;" In summary, the paper presents several flaws that need to be addressed in this particular field.
Below are some suggestions that the authors may wish to consider to improve their manuscript:
General remarks:
- The English language of the manuscript needs to be edited. There are some grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. Some suggestions:
1- Abstract: Rotavirus infection is still…
2- Abstract: This study was aimed to…
3- Abstract: 276 cases were positive…
4- Results: The main clinical manifestations of children (omit "our")
5- Discussion: "We found" instead of "we discovered"
Introduction
- Although the main focus of the study is about Rotavirus infection, the authors have not addressed the virological aspects of the virus. They should add descriptions about the

classification of rotavirus, various genotypes of the virus, the prevalence distribution of the rotavirus and etc. in the introduction section.
Materials & methods:
- It would be recommended to add some details about the method used for virus detection.
- How was the status of rotavirus vaccination in the studies of children?
Results:
- Please mention the percentage of watery diarrhea, vomiting, and fever.
- In the material & method section the authors mentioned the microbiological data but in the result section, no data is presented in this regard.
Thanks.

Farzin Sadeghi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
1- There are some grammatical errors that must be corrected. Abstract Section-Line2 (This study was to obtain information)
2- Do not use the first-person when rewriting (ie. "we" and "our").
3- More information/rationale is required for the authors' study in the introduction. For example, elaborate on Rotavirus's importance.
4- In material and methods, it is better include IDEA rotavirus enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay kit characteristics. (Sensitivity and Specifity and.....)
5- In Material and methods: the description of the rotavirus enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay is necessary. The paragraph should be included.
6- Discussion- The discussion needs a good deal of work to sell the significance of the study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Jul 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major 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) 2 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.

September 8, 2020

Dear editor and reviwers,

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript entitled "*Epidemiology of acute rotavirus diarrhea among hospitalized children under 5 years of age in Hefei China during 2015-2018*"(ID 10556) by Li Ping Yuan, et al. We sincerely appreciate the reviewer's comments. The concerns of the reviewers and their suggestions for improvement of the manuscript have been addressed. All changes made to the text are marked in red so that they may be easily identified. We also provide a point-by-point response to the comments thereinafter.

We are looking forward to your response.

With best regards.

sincerely,
Li-ping Yuan,
Department of Pediatrics, the First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, Hefei,China

Thank you very much. We appreciate your informative comments and suggestions. Our responses to the comments are as follows. Hope these could help make the paper more acceptable for publication.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Regarding the manuscript entitled" Epidemiology of acute rotavirus diarrhea among hospitalized children under 5 years of age in Hefei China during 2015-2018;" In summary, the paper presents several flaws that need to be addressed in this particular field.

Below are some suggestions that the authors may wish to consider to improve their manuscript:

General remarks:

-The English language of the manuscript needs to be edited. There are some grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. Some suggestions:

1. Abstract: Rotavirus infection is still…

Response: Thanks for your sugesstion. We have revised it. And we have re-edited the English language of our manuscript.

2.Abstract: This study was aimed to…

Response: Thanks! We have revised it.

3.Abstract: 276 cases were positive…

Response: Thanks! We have revised it.

4-Results: The main clinical manifestations of children (omit "our")

Response: Thanks! We have revised it.

5-Discussion: "We found" instead of "we discovered"

Response: Thanks! We have revised it.

Introduction

-Although the main focus of the study is about Rotavirus infection, the authors have not addressed the virological aspects of the virus. They should add descriptions about classification of rotvirus, various genotypes of virus, the prevalence distribution of the rotavirus and etc. in the introduction section.

Response: Thanks! We have added some descriptions about rotvirus which are marked in red in the part of **Introduction**.

Materials & methods:
-It would be recommended to add some details about the method used for virus detection.
Response: Thanks! We have added the **part of virus detection** in detail.

-How was the status of rotavirus vaccination in the studies children?
Response: Thanks! We have explained it in the part of **Materials & methods**, which are marked in red.

Results:
-Please mention to the percentage of watery diarrhea, vomiting and fever.
Response: Thanks!We have added it.

-In the material & method section the authors mentioned to the microbiological data but in the result section no data in presented in this regard.
Response: Thanks! We have explained it.

Reviewer 2:
1-There are some grammatical errors which must be corrected. Abstract Section-Line2 (This study was to obtain information)
Response: Thanks! We have revised it. And we have re-edited the English language of our manuscript.

2-Do not use the first-person when rewriting (ie. "we" and "our").
Response: Thanks! We have paid attention to it.

3-More information/rationale is required for the authors' study in the introduction. For example, elaborate on Rotavirus importance.
Response: Thanks! We have added some descriptions about rotvirus which are marked in red in the part of **Introduction.**

4- In material and methods, it is better include IDEA rotavirus enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay kit characteristics..(Sensitivity and Specifity and…..)
Response: Thanks! We have added the **part of virus detection** in detail.

5- In Material and methods: the description of the rotavirus enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay is necessary. The paragraph should be included.
Response: Thanks! We have added the **part of virus detection** in detail.

6- Discussion- The discussion needs a good deal of work to sell the significance of study.
Response: Thanks! We have added some information in the part of Discussion, which are marked in red.

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)** 11 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,

Pleases correct the following items and resubmit.

1) Reformate ABSTRACT based on JJM instruction (add subheadings INTRODUCTION OBJECTIVES, METHODS, RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS for abstract).

2) Reformat all references according to JJM format. Add DOI, PubMed ID, PMCID ID as follow (Use JJM Endnote style):

Youssef SS, Abbas EAE, Mostafa A, el Zanaty T, Seif SM. Association of IL28B polymorphism with fibrosis, liver inflammation, gender respective natural history of hepatitis C virus in Egyptian patients with genotype 4. J Interf Cytok Res. 2014;34(1):22–7. doi: 10.1089/jir.2013.0036. [PubMed: 23981065].

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

September 14, 2020

Dear editor and reviwers,

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript entitled "*Epidemiology of acute rotavirus diarrhea among hospitalized children under 5 years of age in Hefei China during 2015-2018*"(ID 10556) by Li Ping Yuan, et al. We sincerely appreciate the reviewer's comments. The concerns of the reviewers and their suggestions for improvement of the manuscript have been addressed. The changes of Abstract and References are marked in blue so that they may be easily identified.

We are looking forward to your response.

With best regards.

sincerely,

Li-ping Yuan,

Department of Pediatrics, the First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, Hefei,China

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 Sep 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.