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.113528
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(6); e113528

Peer Review Report for "Risk Factor Analysis of Brucellosis in Hulunbuir, China, Using the Propensity Score Matching Method"

Author(s): Li Peng, Xiuwen Liang, Lei Zhu, Chen Liang, Chenfang Liu, Xiaohui Chi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 7 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 7 Aug 2021

Revision (0)

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

Farhad Safarpoor Dehkordi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 21 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should address my comments added in the attached file.
CHEERS
FSD

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 25 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript has focused on the risk factors analysis of brucellosis infection in Hulunbuir, China, using the propensity score matching (PSM) method.
- The research topic is novelty and interest.
But:
- A language check is recommended.
- Please refer to other literature and revise the introduction to give a concrete background of this study.
- The discussion needs a lot more information about "the correlation analysis of protective behavior, brucellosis infection and education level"
Thanks.

Hossein Motamedi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 May 2021

Dear EIC,
According to reviewer's comments this manuscript needs major revision.
Best Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 May 2021

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 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.

Title of paper:

Risk Factor Analysis of Brucellosis in Hulunbuir, China, Using the Propensity Score Matching Method

Dear editor,

On behalf of all my colleagues, I'd like to thank you very much for your positive decision on our manuscript. We thank the reviewers for carefully reading our manuscript and for giving detailed comments and suggestions that have been helpful to improve the manuscript. We addressed all of the reviewer's comments. Detailed responses are given below (reviewer's comments are in italics)

To Reviewer 1,

We would like to express our sincere appreciation for your careful reading and helpful comments. Those comments are all valuable for revising and improving our manuscript. Please find the comments and the responses below:

1. *Language check is recommended*

   We have revised the language.

2. *Please refer other literature and revise introduction to give a concrete background of this study*

   We have added this part of the content, please refer to lines 45-47.

3. *The discussion needs a lot more information about "the correlation analysis of protective*

behavior, brucellosis infection and education level"

We have added this part of the content , please refer to lines 182-186.

To Reviewer 2,

We appreciate your comments on our manuscript, these comments helped us improve our manuscript as well as provide important guidance for our future researches. We have addressed the comments to the best of our abilities. Please find the comments and the responses below:

1. *Text is full from grammatical and topographical mistakes. Text should check by a native English speaker.*

   We have revised the language.

2. *Problem with initial capitalization.*

   We have revised and checked all initial capitalization issues in the article, please refer to the full text.

3. *Add the following references*

   We have added references to the article, please refer to references 5-7.

4. *Add the section objectives here.*

   We have added this part of the content, please refer to lines 45-47.

5. *Which kinds of Brucella was recorder in this survey?*

   This study did not distinguish the types of bacteria in detail, because the study mainly focused on the risk factors of brucellosis.

6. *How did the authors determined the size of samples?*

   This study using multi-stage stratified cluster random sampling and randomly selected residents of 6 villages in A and B banners of Hulunbuir. The sample size is obtained strictly

according to the sample size calculation formula.

7. *This reference was not available among references list.*

   Diagnostic Criteria for Brucellosis (WS269-2007) is not a reference, but the version number of the diagnostic criteria.

8. *Add the country name.*

   We have added the country of instrument production, please refer to line 69.

9. *Add the statistical analysis used in the study.*

   We have added this part, please refer to 78-84.

10. *Delete S. Your tables should numbered alphabetically using the Arabic number. 1, 2, 3, …*

    Table S1 is the first table of supplementary materials

11. *Please add an epidemiological figure of the study population and rea*.

    We have added this part, please refer to 177-182.

12. Add some more exact findings and solutions of your work here.

    We have added this part, please refer to 232-234.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Jul 2021

Dear EIC
I can not evaluate the revised manuscript.
The authors should note when resubmitting the 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. Moreover, put a line number for each response.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 Jul 2021

Dear Author
Many thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript for JJM. 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. Moreover, highlight corrected text as well as put line numbers for each comment.
Regards

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.

Title of paper:

Risk Factor Analysis of Brucellosis in Hulunbuir, China, Using the Propensity Score Matching Method

Dear editor,

On behalf of all my colleagues, I'd like to thank you very much for your positive decision on our manuscript. We thank the reviewers for carefully reading our manuscript and for giving detailed comments and suggestions that have been helpful to improve the manuscript. We addressed all of the reviewer's comments. Detailed responses are given below (reviewer's comments are in italics)

To Reviewer 1,

We would like to express our sincere appreciation for your careful reading and helpful comments. Those comments are all valuable for revising and improving our manuscript. Please find the comments and the responses below:

1. *Language check is recommended*

   We have revised the language.

2. *Please refer other literature and revise introduction to give a concrete background of this study*

   Objectives : In this study, the propensity score matching (PSM) method was used to analyze the epidemiological characteristics of brucellosis and explore the risk factors of brucellosis infection in Hulunbuir, Inner Mongolia, China. We have added this part of the content, please

refer to lines 45-47.

3. *The discussion needs a lot more information about "the correlation analysis of protective behavior, brucellosis infection and education level"*

   For the prevention of brucellosis, it is necessary to frequently open windows for ventilation, avoid contact with animals that have not been quarantined, and strictly disinfect the environment where the animals are raised. On the other hand, effective vaccines can also effectively prevent the spread of brucellosis. We have added this part of the content , please refer to lines 195-198.

To Reviewer 2,

We appreciate your comments on our manuscript, these comments helped us improve our manuscript as well as provide important guidance for our future researches. We have addressed the comments to the best of our abilities. Please find the comments and the responses below:

1. *Text is full from grammatical and topographical mistakes. Text should check by a native English speaker.*

   We have revised the language.

2. *Problem with initial capitalization.*

   We have revised and checked all initial capitalization issues in the article, please refer to the full text.

3. *Add the following references*

   We have added references to the article, please refer to references 5-7.

   Safarpoor Dehkordi F. 2012. Retraction: Incidence Study of Brucella abortus and Brucella

melitensis in Bovine and Buffalo Semen Samples by Real-Time PCR Assay in Iran. J Vet Med Sci.

Dehkordi FS, Valizadeh Y, Birgani T, Dehkordi K. 2014. Prevalence study of Brucella melitensis and Brucella abortus in cow's milk using dot enzyme linked immuno sorbent assay and duplex polymerase chain reaction. J Pure Appl Microbiol 8:1065-9.

Dehkordi FS, Saberian S, Momtaz H. 2012. Detection and segregation of Brucella abortus and Brucella melitensis in Aborted Bovine, Ovine, Caprine, Buffaloes and Camelid Fetuses by application of conventional and real-time polymerase chain reaction. The Thai Journal of Veterinary Medicine 42:13.

4. *Add the section objectives here.*

Objectives： In this study, the propensity score matching (PSM) method was used to analyze the epidemiological characteristics of brucellosis and explore the risk factors of brucellosis infection in Hulunbuir, Inner Mongolia, China. We have added this part of the content, please refer to lines 45-47.

5. *Which kinds of Brucella was recorder in this survey?*

This study did not distinguish the types of bacteria in detail, because the study mainly focused on the risk factors of brucellosis.

6. *How did the authors determined the size of samples?*

This study using multi-stage stratified cluster random sampling and randomly selected residents of 6 villages in A and B banners of Hulunbuir. The sample size is obtained strictly according to the sample size calculation formula.

7. *This reference was not available among references list.*

Diagnostic Criteria for Brucellosis (WS269-2007) is not a reference, but the version number of

the diagnostic criteria.

8. *Add the country name.*

   We have added the country of instrument production, please refer to line 69. All the instruments and equipment are made in China.

9. *Add the statistical analysis used in the study.*

   We have added this part, please refer to 78-84. Epidata 13.0 software was used to establish the database and to enter the questionnaire. SAS 9.4 software was used for data analysis. Data were compared using a Two-sided test at a α value of 0.05. Quantitative data are shown as the mean ± SE. Comparisons between groups were performed using an analysis of variance. For qualitative data, descriptions were described in the form of frequencies (%). A chi-square test (including continuity correction methods and Fisher exact probability methods were used for differential analysis.

10. *Delete S. Your tables should numbered alphabetically using the Arabic number. 1, 2, 3, …*

    Table S1 is the first table of supplementary materials.

11. *Please add an epidemiological figure of the study population and rea*.

    We have added this part, please refer to 190-195. Inner Mongolia Autonomous is an endemic area of animal and human brucellosis in China. Reports indicate that a total of 22,848 human brucellosis cases were reported in a certain area of Inner Mongolia from 2004 to 2019, with an average annual incidence of 87.2 per 100,000. Human brucellosis exhibited a significant increasing trend and B. melitensis is the main pathogen responsible for human brucellosis in this region.

12. Add some more exact findings and solutions of your work here.

    We have added this part, please refer to 245-247. Research results show that feeding

livestock, carrying lambs regularly, and raising livestock without protective measures all increase the risk of contracting brucellosis.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 7 Aug 2021

Dear EIC
The manuscript was completely revised based on reviewers and associated editor comments and it is acceptable for publishing in JJM.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 Aug 2021

Dear Author,
I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology and sent to the publisher for the next process. Please remember to always include your manuscript number, whenever inquiring about your manuscript. When you receive the proofs for your article, please check all names and affiliations very carefully, as these cannot be corrected once the article is published. Moreover, Please add the ORCID number to you and your collages account as soon as possible. For more details
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.