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.117884
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(7); e117884

Peer Review Report for "Application of Polymerase Chain Reaction in Diphtheria Laboratory Examination: A Field Need"

Author(s): Sunarno Sunarno, Nelly Puspandari, Dwi Febriyana, Tati Febrianti, Ratih Dian Saraswati, Novi Sulistyaningrum, Noer Endah Pracoyo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Jul 2021
Revised Date: 27 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 28 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
Based on reviewing the above manuscript the below comments should be considered:
1-Abstract needs to be revised based on journal guidelines. Also, authors should consider that statistical methods should also be included.
2- Keywords should be rechecked based on Mesh format.
3- How and why did the authors conclude that the developed PCR method was superior to the conventional method. The detailed information should be included in the discussion part.
4- Statistical analysis method should also be included in material and method part.
5- Since the manuscript has few findings and achievements, that manuscript could be considered as a short communication.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
- The whole text should be corrected in terms of English writing.
- In the statistical analysis section, the used statistical methods should be mentioned.

- In line 77: DNA isolation to be replaced by DNA extraction.
- Line number 92-94 should be rewritten.
- The positive and negative predictive values of the PCR method compared to the standard method as well as the sensitivity and specificity of the PCR method towards the gold standard method are better to be expressed.

Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Aug 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. Moreover, add line number for text and put suitable line numbers for each response.
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 (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.

Authors Respond to Peer Reviewer Comments

To :

Prof. Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi

Editors-In-Chief

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled "**The PCR Application in Diphtheria Laboratory: A Field Needs"** [ID Number : **117884**] to **Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology**. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my manuscript. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Comments from Reviewer #1:

Dear editor in chief of JJM,

Based on reviewing the above manuscript the below comments should be considered:

1. Abstract needs to be revised based on journal guideline. Also authors should consider that statistical methods should also be included.

   The abstract has been revised according to journal guidelines including mentioning the type of statistical analysis used in accordance with the reviewer's suggestions.

2. Keywords should be rechecked based on Mesh format.

   Keywords have been corrected according to the reviewer's suggestion.

3. How and why did the authors concluded that the developed PCR method was superior to conventional method. The detailed information should be included in discussion part.

We only mentioned that PCR has advantages in terms of sensitivity. This does not mean that PCR is superior in all respects when compared to conventional methods. The conclusion is drawn based on the results of statistical tests. We need to convey this in relation to the problems commonly experienced in the field as we emphasize more in the conclusions.

4. Statistical analysis method should also be included in material and method part.

   Statistical analysis has been included in the method according to the reviewer's suggestion

5. Since the manuscript has little findings and achievement, that manuscript could be considered as short communication.

   We still propose this manuscript as the original article because the sort communication format will limit the information that can be conveyed. However, if it is a necessity, we will reformat it and resubmit it as a sort of communication.

Comments from Reviewer #1:

1. The whole text should be corrected in terms of English writing. Ok

   English proofread has been done through the services listed at Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology.

2. In the statistical analysis section, the used statistical methods should be mentioned.

   Statistical analysis has been included in the abstract and methods according to the reviewer's suggestion.

3. In line 77: DNA isolation to be replaced by DNA extraction. Ok

   It has been replaced with “DNA extraction” according to the reviewer's suggestion.

4. Line number 92-94 should be rewritten.

   The positive and negative predictive values of PCR method compared to the standard method as well as the sensitivity and specificity of PCR method towards gold standard method are better to be expressed.

   Thank you for your suggestions. However, the sentence suggested by the reviewer as stated in the comments cannot be added because eventhough the statistical test results show that PCR is more sensitive than the conventional method, PCR examination cannot replace the conventional method as the gold standard. as we know each method has advantages and disadvantages. We add a statement at the end of the discussion that we recommend PCR as an additional examination rather than a substitute for conventional methods.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear editor

This manuscript needs based on the reviewer's comments major revision.

Best Regards

Abstract

1. Delete “The data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel 2010.” Which test was used for analysis (add P-value)?

   These sentences have been deleted according to the input of the associate editors and replaced with statistical analysis according to the suggestions of reviewers #1 and #2.

Background

1. Separate Background from Objectives. Add a heading as “Objective” at the end of the background.

   An "Objective" subtitle has been added to the background according to the journal guidelines and the associate editor's suggestion

Methods

1. Add the period of study.

   A research period has been added in the method according to the associate editor's suggestion.

2. Statistical Analysis, which test was used for data analysis?

   Statistical analysis has been added as suggested by reviewers 1 and 2 and associate editor.

Apart from the comments above, all spelling errors, grammar and sentence structure have been corrected according to the reviewer 's suggestion.

We look forward to hearing from you in due time regarding our submission and to respond to any further questions and comments you may have.

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) 28 Aug 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Aug 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.