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.117928
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(6); e117928

Peer Review Report for "Susceptibility Evaluation of Clinically Isolated HSV-1 Strains to Acyclovir: A Phenotypic and Genotypic Study"

Author(s): Nasrin Aliabadi, Marzieh Jamalidoust, Gholamreza Pouladfar, Nahid Heydari Marandi, Atoosa Ziyaeyan, Ali Amanati, Mazyar Ziyaeyan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Jul 2021
Revised Date: 3 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 3 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)

20 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Inclusion and exclusion criteria for study population (patients) should be describe in material and method section.
2- For diagnosis of HSV, Viral titer determination using plaque assay and HSV genotyping, the author was addressed to references 28 and 29 but there are not Ref 27 and 28 in reference list.
3- In phenotypic analysis method: in the sentence of “Then, 10 mL of diluted virus (multiplicity of infection 0.1) was added into each well” Apparently misspelled and the volume of 10 microliters should be replaced.
4- What was the basis for using concentrations 0.01, 0.05 and 0.1 µg/mL of Acyclovir in phenotypic analysis method? Reference should be given in this regard.
5- In method section, more details should be given on how to calculate the percent susceptibility in each plate.
6- In the discussion section, more details should be described about the results of the phenotypic assays compared to other studies.
7- What type of agar was used for plaque assay?

8- For the study of the dose of toxicity of Acyclovir in cell line, MTT assay should be performed.
9- For drawing the phylogenetic tree, from new version of MEGA (MEGA X) should be used.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 Jul 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) 27 Jul 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.
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 is 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.

Manuscript ID 117928 Response to Reviewers

Dear Sir / Madam

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript "Susceptibility evaluation of clinically isolated HSV 1 strains to acyclovir: a phenotypic and genotypic study" for publication in the Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on our work. We have adequately addressed most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. Please see below, in bold, for a point by point response to the reviewer's comments. All page numbers refer to the revised manuscript file with tracked changes.

Reviewers' Comments to the Authors:

1- Inclusion and exclusion criteria for study population (patients) should be describe in material and method section.

With thanks, inclusion and exclusion criteria was as follow; immunocompromised patients such as solid organ transplant with recurrent HSV infections and immunocompetent individuals in different age groups were included in this study. HIV patients and pregnant women were excluded from the study.

2- For diagnosis of HSV, Viral titer determination using plaque assay and HSV genotyping, the author was addressed to references 28 and 29 but there are not Ref 27 and 28 in reference list.

Thanks for your attention, Refs 28 and 29 were revised in the text (Lines 81 and 92 in the Methods section).

3- In phenotypic analysis method: in the sentence of "Then, 10 mL of diluted virus (multiplicity of infection 0.1) was added into each well" Apparently misspelled and the volume of 10 microliters should be replaced.

With thanks, the item mentioned was corrected in the text (Line 122 in the Methods section).

4- What was the basis for using concentrations 0.01, 0.05 and 0.1 µg/mL of Acyclovir in phenotypic analysis method? Reference should be given in this regard.

Thanks for your attention, references 16 and 17 were added.

5- In method section, more details should be given on how to calculate the percent susceptibility in each plate.

With Thanks, we added "The percentage of inhibition (%I) was calculated for each concentrations as follows: %I = (1 - number of viral plaques in treated wells/number of viral plaques in virus control) ×100", line 135-137 in the Methods section).

6- In the discussion section, more details should be described about the results of the phenotypic assays compared to other studies.

With thanks, in the present study, we attempted to compare most of the amino acid substitutions found in the genotypic study with the phenotypic and genotypic assays in other studies (lines 223-255 in the Discussion section).

7-What type of agar was used for plaque assay?

With Thanks, the type of agar was added in the text (Line 95 in the Methods section), "Agar extra pure, 1.01615.0100 Merck, Germany".

8-For the study of dose of toxicity of Acyclovir in cell line, MTT assay should be performed.

With thanks, the three concentrations of acyclovir selected were based on laboratory findings and other studies, according to which we found out which concentration of acyclovir indicated resistance, intermediate or sensitive strains.

9-For drawing phylogenetic tree, from new version of MEGA (MEGA X) should be used.

With thanks, the proposed software was used to draw a phylogenetic tree.

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) 1 Aug 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors should put inclusion and exclusion criteria in the material and methods section.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 1 Aug 2021

Dear Author,
Pleases put inclusion and exclusion criteria in the manuscript text (Methods).
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.

Manuscript ID 117928 Response to Reviewers

Dear Sir / Madam

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript "Susceptibility evaluation of clinically isolated HSV 1 strains to acyclovir: a phenotypic and genotypic study" for publication in the Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on our work. We have adequately addressed most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted in yellow in the manuscript. Please see below, in bold, for a point by point response to the reviewer's comments. All page numbers refer to the revised manuscript file with tracked changes.

Reviewers' Comments to the Authors:

Pleases put inclusion and exclusion criteria in the material and methods section.

With thanks, Inclusion and exclusion criteria were added in the text (lines 78-80 in the Methods section).

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) 3 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.