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.114374
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(6); e114374

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus in South Korea"

Author(s): Umar Saeed, Zahra Zahid Piracha, Sara Rizwan Uppal, Rizwan Uppal

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Mar 2021
Revised Date: 9 Jul 2021
Accepted Date: 10 Jul 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)

4 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this valuable manuscript to the journal. The authors should pay attention to the following points
- The name of "SARS_COV2" is the cause of the disease, while the name of "MERS" is the disease. This point should be noted and corrected in the title and body of the manuscript.
- SARS-CoV-2 A species of BETACORONAVIRUS causing atypical respiratory disease (COVID-19) in humans while MERS is the virus disease caused by the coronavirus genus (MERS-CoV)
- Please delete or match the word “SARS_COV2” in the title as described above.
- The word "MERS" in the Keywords section should be changed to the "Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus" or "MERS-CoV” in accordance with MESH: “https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/ “
- Please, global numbers of SARS-CoV-2 positive and numbers of deaths change to the latest number and data
- Your handwriting is appropriate after reviewing the issues raised.
Sincerely.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
reviewer's comments are as follow:
1- there is a dictation error in the manuscript
2- it is better to use tables and diagrams to show information
3- it was more scientific if authors evaluate participants into groups including high and low educated people and find a significant relationships by statistical analysis or evaluate other factors like accessibility to technology and people's source of information.
Overall, in my viewpoint, the given information in this manuscript is very low and the authors did not use any experimental procedures so it is not matching with the journal's scope and could not be accepted for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript could be published after major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 17 Apr 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 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. 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.

April.19th, 2021

Editor in Chief, Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Dear Editor in Chief,

Re: 114374 (**Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV in South Korea.**)

I would like to re-submit the revised manuscript to be considered for publication in **Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology**

Newly added or revised sentences in the manuscript are highlighted with '**Purple**'.

The POINT-BY-POINT responses to the comments provided by reviewers are following:

The POINT-BY-POINT responses to reviewers

Reviewer #1 (Comments for the Author):

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. Please pay attention to the following points

The name of "SARS_COV2" is the cause of the disease, while the name of "MERS" is the disease. This point should be noted and corrected in the title and body of the manuscript.

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

1. Yes. Thank you for your valuable suggestions the manuscript has been revised accordingly.

SARS-CoV-2 A species of BETACORONAVIRUS causing atypical respiratory disease (COVID-19) in humans while MERS is the virus disease caused by the coronavirus genus (MERS-CoV)

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

Yes. Thank you for your esteemed comment. We have revised accordingly.

Please delete or match the word "SARS_COV2" in the title as described above.

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

Yes. Thank you for your esteemed comment. We have deleted accordingly.

The word "MERS" in the Keywords section should be changed to the "Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus" or "MERS-CoV" in accordance with MESH

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

Yes. Thank you for your esteemed comment. We have revised with MERS-CoV accordingly.

Please, global numbers of SARS-CoV-2 positive and numbers of deaths change to the latest number and data

Yes. Thank you for your suggestion. We have updated latest number and data accordingly.

Reviewer 2:

Dear editor
Reviewer's comments are as follow:

there is dictation error in the manuscript

2. Response to Reviewer 2:

Yes. Thank you for your valuable suggestions; the manuscript has been revised accordingly.

it is better to use tables and diagrams to show information

2. Response to Reviewer 2:

Yes. Thank you for your valuable suggestions; in our next study we shall include the table and diagrams.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

According to reviewer comments the manuscript could be published after major revision

1. Response to Associate Editor 1:

Yes. Thank you for your esteemed comment. We have revised the manuscript according to your esteemed guidelines.

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) 16 May 2021

Dear AE,
Reviewer's comments are as follow:
- If this assessment been performed simultaneously for both diseases? Given that the two epidemics are different in terms of the time of occurrence
- How is Mers different from coronavirus SARS and the common cold? (Line 37)
- Is the study of Mers retrospective?
- Please review the English text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 May 2021

Dear AE,
These are some major problems that were observed in the manuscript
1. Demographic information about participants in the survey such as age and degree of education is not clear.
2. All the information should be present in tables for better understanding.
Thanks.

niloofar neisi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 May 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled "Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV in South Korea" needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 May 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 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. https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html

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.

May.26th, 2021

Editor in Chief, Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Dear Editor in Chief,

Re: 114374 (Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV in South Korea.)

I would like to re-submit the revised manuscript to be considered for publication in **Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology**

Newly added or revised sentences in the manuscript are highlighted with '**Purple**'.

The POINT-BY-POINT responses to the comments provided by reviewers are following:

The POINT-BY-POINT responses to reviewers

Reviewer #1 (Comments for the Author):

Reviewer's comments are as follow:

- If this assessment been performed simultaneously for both diseases? Given that the two epidemics are different in terms of time of occurrence

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

1. Yes. Thank you for your valuable suggestions the manuscript has been revised accordingly.
2. Although the time of occurrence of MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 was different, yet based upon the experiences of emergency preparedness centers, paramedical staff, and government officials, the surge of COVID-19 in South Korea was effectively tackled within short period of time. Therefore we asked whether the previous knowledge, awareness and attitude of general population of South Korea about MERS-CoV contribute for emergency preparedness and development of smart information technologies against SARS-CoV-2 spread.

- How is Mers different from coronavirus SARS and the common cold? (Line 37)

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

1) Yes. Thank you for your esteemed comment. We have revised accordingly.
2) We have incorporated Table 1, which can clearly differentiate between the aforementioned viruses

- Is the study of Mers retrospective?

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

No, the study is cross-sectional study, as done with SAR-CoV-2.

- Please review the English text.

1. Yes. Thank you for your valuable suggestions the manuscript has been revised accordingly.

Reviewer 2:

hese are some major problems that were observed in the manuscript

1. Demographic information about participants in the survey such as age and degree of education is not clear.

Response to Reviewer 2:

a) Yes. Thank you for your valuable suggestions; the manuscript has been revised accordingly.
b) We have incorporated Table 2, which clearly provides the details about demographics and other parameters

2. All the information should be present in tables for better understanding.

Response to Reviewer 2:

a. Yes. Thank you for your valuable suggestions; the manuscript has been revised accordingly.
b) We have incorporated Table 3 and 4, which provides the knowledge, awareness attitudes of the participants towards SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

The manuscript entitled "Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV in South Korea" needs minor revision.

1. Response to Associate Editor 1:

Yes. Thank you for your esteemed comment. We have revised the manuscript according to your esteemed guidelines.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 25 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the brief report the authors sent, I must say that the current study presents awareness and knowledge, and epidemic prevention abilities among South Koreans, and it can be a model for other countries. Therefore, it is a good study. Please review the text once again in terms of writing rules and put the information of table number 2 in the text and delete the table itself.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 6 Jul 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled " Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV in South Korea" can be published after minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Jul 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.
1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. In addition, JJM INSTRUCTION attached to the mail, pleases find it.
5. 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 (3)

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.

July .06th, 2021

Dear Editor in Chief,

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Re: 114374 (Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV in South Korea.)

I would like to re-submit the revised manuscript (after minor changes) to be considered for publication in **Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology**

Newly added or revised sentences in the manuscript are highlighted with '**Purple**'.

The POINT-BY-POINT responses to the comments provided by reviewers are following:

The POINT-BY-POINT responses to reviewers

Reviewer 1:
Dear author.
Thanks for the brief report you sent, I must say that the current study presents awareness and knowledge, and epidemic prevention abilities among South Koreans, and it can be a model for other countries. Therefore, it is a good study. Please review the text once again in terms of writing rules and put the information of table number 2 in the text and delete the table itself.

1. Response to Reviewer 1:

1. Thank you very much for your valuable comments on the manuscript.
2. The text has been reviewed and modified according to the esteemed suggestions and guidelines.
3. The information from the table number 2 has been incorporated into the manuscript and table itself has been deleted from the study.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript entitled " Evaluation of Epidemic Prevention Abilities for SARS-CoV-2 and MERS-CoV in South Korea" can be published after minor revision.

1. Yes. Thank you for your valuable comment the manuscript, we have revised all said minor changes and incorporated them into the manuscript.
2. Furthermore, it is requested to kindly proceed the manuscript towards publication on earliest.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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** (3) 10 Jul 2021

Dear EIC
The manuscript is completely revised according to reviewer comments by authors and it is acceptable for publishing.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 10 Jul 2021

Dear Authors,
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.