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.112775
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(3); e112775

Peer Review Report for "Post-Liver Transplant Cytomegalovirus (CMV) Reactivation, Graft, and Patient Survival Rates in Iranian Population"

Author(s): Marzieh Jamalidoust, Mandana Namayandeh, Gholamreza Pouladfar, Mazyar Ziyaeyan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 9 May 2021
Accepted Date: 10 May 2021

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) — 11 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should pay attention to the following points
- Please explain the abbreviations
- Write the p-value in the summary
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be written separately.
- Tables 2, 3, and 4 are not suitable, please integrate them into the text. Tables 4 and 6 should be plotted.
- Figure 1 and Figure 2 are best placed in supplementary
- Explaining the diagnosis and methods are very brief, please check further.
- Do you have a code of ethics?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 27 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
I think the author's idea is good and valuable but it would be good to revise your paper. First of all, the quality of the paper is poor. This manuscript must be checked and revised.

Abstract

1. The introduction must be rearranged. It should be started with an explanation of CMV and liver transplantation. For example, Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection is a common complication after liver transplantation,…

2. The number of participants in the study should be reported.

3. Frothy one may have been better substituted by 41.

4. Revision is needed.

Introduction

Please describe the CMV diagnosis system in Iran.

Methods

1. I suggest modifying the material and method section. For example, the study population must be written in detail.

2. Please describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

3. Parameters as R+/D+ are never fully described. Only acronyms are not sufficient.

4. Please delete the following sentences from this section. In this study, we followed up CMV genome burden in LT patients, after operation and hospitalization.

5. Overall, the material and method section is not well written.

Results

- The result section must be rearranged.

Discussion

- Discussion is premature and inconclusive. Revision is needed.

Conclusion

- The conclusion section was missed.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,

The manuscript entitled " Post liver transplant CMV reactivation, graft and patient survival rates in Iranian population" needs major revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,

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 the 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 is 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. https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/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.

Dear Prof. Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi

Editor-in-Chief, Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

With special thanks for your letter and the revision of the paper entitled **"Post liver transplant CMV reactivation, graft and patient survival rates in Iranian population",** the comments by the reviewer have been immensely helpful and informative. Also, I should appreciate your insightful comments on the different part of our manuscript.

Both reviewers' comments were adequately addressed in the paper with corresponding individual responses included. The revisions and changes have been approved of by all authors and I have again been chosen as the first author. The changes are distinguished in the text, as suggested.

We hope the revisions have improved the paper so that it is worthy of publication in your esteemed journal *Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology*.

Sincerely,

Reviewer comments, author responses and manuscript changes:

Comments from Reviewer 1 and our responses:

1- ***Please explain the abbreviations:*** The abbreviation is mentioned in the end of references as suggested by the reviewer.
2- ***Write the p-value in the summary*****:** p-value added in abstract section.
3- ***Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be written separately*****:** according the reviewers comment, inclusion criteria was written in result section.
4- ***Tables 2, 3, and 4 are not suitable, please integrate them into the text. Tables 4 and 6 should be plotted:*** all changes in the tables were done.
5- ***Explaining of the diagnosis and methods are very brief, please check further:*** the method was described in detail as recommended by reviewer.
6- ***Do you have a code of ethics?*** Yes, the proposal with 93-12 number was confirmed in research ethical committee of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences.

Comments from Reviewer 2 and our responses

bstract

1. The introduction must be rearranged. It should be started with an explanation of CMV and liver transplantation. For example, Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection is a common complication after liver transplantation,…
2. The number of participants in the study should be reported.

3. Frothy one may have been better substituted by 41.
4. Revision is needed.

Introduction

Please describe the CMV diagnosis system in Iran.
Methods
1. I suggest modifying the material and method section. For example, the study population must be written in detail.
2. Please describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
3. Parameters as R+/D+ are never fully described. Only acronyms are not sufficient.
4. Please delete the following sentences from this section. In this study, we followed up CMV genome burden in LT patients, after operation and hospitalization.
5. Overall, the material and method section is not well written.
Results
The result section must be rearranged.
Discussion
Discussion is premature and inconclusive. Revision is needed.
Conclusion
The conclusion section was missed.

All of reviewer 2 comments were considered and responded

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)** 10 May 2021

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 the ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. For more details: https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.