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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.122090
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 15(1); e122090

Peer Review Report for "Simultaneous Detection of Multiple Respiratory Viruses Among SARS-CoV-2-Positive and Negative Patients by Multiplex TaqMan One-Step Real-Time PCR"

Author(s): Parsa Veisi, Somayeh Shatizadeh Malekshahi, Hamzeh Choobin, Mohammad Reza Jabbari, Peyman Mohammadi Torbati

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 25 Dec 2021
- Revised Date: 22 Jan 2022
- Accepted Date: 28 Jan 2022

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) 31 Dec 2021

Dear AE,
In the case of the manuscript entitled “Simultaneous detection of multiple respiratory viruses among SARSCoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients by multiplex TaqMan One-Step real-time PCR” I should mention that:
The aim of this study was to investigate the prevalence of 17 viral respiratory pathogens other than SARS-CoV-2 among SARS-CoV-2 ± patients during the COVID-19 pandemic in Iran. This topic could be beneficial. However, there are some points that should be mentioned:
1- This manuscript, reported the prevalence of 17 respiratory viruses in SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative patients. However, throughout the manuscript it was mentioned that coinfections were compared in these groups of patients. As, in SARS-CoV-2 negative patients no coinfection was reported this issue should be considered and corrected throughout the manuscript.

2- Some of the results were presented both in the text and table, the repeated data should be omitted. Moreover, demographic and clinical characteristics of studied populations were compared between SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative patients in table 3, so table 1 should be omitted.
3- There are some badly worded/constructed sentences in the manuscript. The manuscript should be revised by a native English speaker.
Taking these points into account I can't endorse the publication of this article as it is. If the manuscript is revised and after revision, it could be suitable for publishing in Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology.
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Jan 2022

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
In this study, the authors have evaluated the frequency of viral respiratory coinfection among patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Iran. The results of the study are valuable, but I have some comments for the authors
Abstract:
1-When abbreviating a term, use the full term the first time you use it: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19.
2-The abstract part has grammatical errors that need to be corrected
3-The conclusion section must be written more briefly and accuracy. You have not find a significant difference in frequency of respiratory viruses between SARS-CoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients.
Method:
4-How the sample size is calculated?
5-Wouldn't you get better results if you had a larger sample size?
Result:
6-Data in Table 2 and Table 4 are somewhat similar. You can integrate Table 2 to Table 4.
Conclusion:
7-The conclusion section must be written more briefly and accuracy. You have not find a significant difference in frequency of respiratory viruses between SARS-CoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients.
8-It is better that an abbreviation section is added to the end of manuscript including full name of viruses and abbreviations.
9-The manuscript has grammatical errors that need to be corrected.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Jan 2022

Dear EIC,
We are pleased to inform the authors that this paper should become acceptable for publication after minor revision. The reviewers, whose comments are appended below, recommend publication after some modifications have been made.
With best wishes

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 15 Jan 2022

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 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.

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 numbers 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 is attached to the mail, pleases find it.

5. 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. Pleases follow the below link for the process.

https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html

Regards

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 Professor Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi,

Editor-in-Chief of Jundishapur journal of microbiology,

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “Simultaneous detection of multiple respiratory viruses among SARSCoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients by multiplex TaqMan One-Step real time PCR" in the Jundishapur journal of microbiology. We would like to thank the reviewer for spending much effort on the manuscript improvement. We went carefully through the comments and applied all the changes accordingly. Moreover, we replied to all comments point by point, separately.

Thanks again for your consideration,

-We would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments.

To Dear reviewer1:

Reviewer Comments to Author:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
In the case of the manuscript entitled “Simultaneous detection of multiple respiratory viruses among SARSCoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients by multiplex TaqMan One-Step real time PCR” I should mention that:
The aim of this study was to investigate the prevalence of 17 viral respiratory pathogens other than SARS-CoV-2 among SARS-CoV-2 ± patients during the COVID-19 pandemic in Iran. This topic could be beneficial. However, there are some points that should be mentioned:

Comment1:
1- This manuscript, reported the prevalence of 17 respiratory viruses in SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative patients. However, throughout the manuscript it was mentioned that coinfections were compared in these groups of patients. As, in SARS-CoV-2 negative patients no coinfection was reported this issue should be considered and corrected throughout the manuscript.

Reply1:

Thanks for your nice comments. The mentioned issue has been corrected throughout the manuscript. In the objective section of abstract we removed “coinfection with” and in the result section of abstract we replaced “coinfecting” by “detected” and also relaced “coinfections” by “frequency”. In the last paragraph of introduction we removed “coinfection with”. In the result section “the prevalence rates of coinfections” replaced by “multiple viral respiratory”. Moreover, we removed “co-infecting” from the “…most prevalent coinfectiong pathogen. In the discussion: “the rate of viral coinfection” changed to “the rates of viral infections”

Comment2:
2- Some of the results were presented both in the text and table, the repeated data should be omitted. Moreover, demographic and clinical characteristics of studied populations were compared between SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative patients in table 3, so table 1 should be omitted.

Reply2:

We omitted table 1 upon dear reviewer request. Moreover, table 2 was omitted because the related data were somewhat similar to table 4. We removed the following sentence from the result section: Detailed characteristics of the study patients and detection rates of respiratory viruses are listed in the table 1 and table 2, respectively.

3- There are some badly worded/constructed sentences in the manuscript. The manuscript should be revised by a native English speaker.

Reply3:

We fully respect dear reviewer comments. The manuscript edited in terms of English usage. Some examples are:

-In the following sentence “specimens collected from December 2020 to March 2021” during changed to from

-In the following “the” added before two: comorbidities between the two groups

-“The” added before national by the national influenza center

- “a” removed before diverse: “is a reservoir for a diverse co-circulating respiratory pathogens”

“s” removed from contributes “but also contributes to public health”

In method section:

-“were” added before “…randomly”, “the” added before “…presence”, “were” added before “…verified”, “were” added before “…tested”.

-“S” removed from “afterwards”, “of” removed from “remaining of”

-“s” added after one in “categorical one”

In result section:

-“the” added before “average”

-“Totally” removed from “Totally, men”

-“who” added before “…tested positive for SARS-CoV-2”

-“The” added before SARS-CoV-2 in the following: from those infected with the SARS-CoV-2 only

In discussion section:

-“a” added before “recent systematic review”

-“virus” changed to “other respiratory viruses

-“might rely on the patients” changed to “might be relied”

-“the” added before “spectrum”

-“RSV, IFV, hMPV was estimated to be…” changed to “RSV, IFV, hMPV were estimated to be”

-“…in Iran high rate of” changed to “…in Iran higher rate of….

-“The” added before “…high circulation of seasonal”

-“The” added before “…COVID-19 outbreak”

-“The” added before “…COVID-19 epidemic”

-“a decrease of influenza” changed to “a decrease in influenza”

-“the” added before “implementation of control strategies”

-“a” added before “…reduction in respiratory viruses”

“the” added before “viral interference”

-“the” added before “2009 IFV pandemic”

-“similar co-infection rate” changed to “ A similar co-infection rate”

In conclusion section:

-“here” added before “expand”

To Dear reviewer2:

Reviewer 2:

In this study, authors have evaluated the frequency of viral respiratory coinfection among patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Iran. The results of the study are valuable, but I have some comments for the authors

Abstract:

Comment1:

1-When abbreviating a term, use the full term the first time you use it: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19.

Reply1:

Thanks for your point. Abbreviations spelled out at first usage in the manuscript as follow:

- Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)

- Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)

Comment2:

2-The abstract part has grammatical errors that need to be corrected

Reply2:

The grammatical errors have been corrected:

-“s” was removed from “demographics”

-“the” added before “…two groups”

-“here” added before “…expand our understanding”

Comment3:

3-The conclusion section must be written more briefly and accuracy. You have not find a significant difference in frequency of respiratory viruses between SARS-CoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients.

Reply3:

The conclusion section has been edited in terms of accuracy. The following sentence omitted: Multi pathogen coinfection, increase the difficulty in clinical diagnosis and treatment. Moreover, in the following sentence “…..interested in the treatment and control of viral respiratory tract infections” we removed treatment.

Method:

4-How the sample size is calculated?
5-Wouldn't you get better results if you had a larger sample size?

Reply4:

We agree with the dear reviewer that low sample size may have prevented us from finding more differences between the co-infection and mono-infection groups. We mentioned in the limitation of the study that multicenter studies with larger sample size are needed. As the prevalence of the co-infection has been reported to be approximately 13.5% in the literature by using this formula the sample size calculated to be 186:

$$n=\frac{Z^2_{1-\alpha/2}\times p\times(1-p)}{d^2}$$

$$186=\frac{2^2\times 0.135\times(1-0.135)}{0.05^2}$$

Result:
Comment6:

6-Data in Table 2 and Table 4 are somewhat similar. You can integrate Table 2 to Table 4.

Reply6:

Thanks for your comments. These two tables integrated together.

Conclusion:
Comment7:

7-The conclusion section must be written more briefly and accuracy. You have not find a significant difference in frequency of respiratory viruses between SARS-CoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients.

Reply7:

The conclusion section has been edited in terms of accuracy. The following sentence omitted: Multi pathogen coinfection, increase the difficulty in clinical diagnosis and treatment. Moreover, in the following sentence “…..interested in the treatment and control of viral respiratory tract infections” we removed treatment.

Comment8:
8-It is better that an abbreviation section is added to the end of manuscript including full name of viruses and abbreviations.

Reply8:

The abbreviation section added at the end of manuscript:

AdVs: Adenoviruses

COVID-19: Coronavirus 2 coronavirus disease 2019

HBoV: Human bocavirus

hMPV: Human metapneumovirus

HCoV-NL63: Coronaviruses NL63

HCoV-HKU1: Human coronavirus HKU1

IFVs: Influenza viruses

PIVs: Parainfluenza viruses

PCR: Polymerase chain reaction

RTIs: Respiratory tract infections

RVs: Rhinoviruses

RSV: Respiratory syncytial virus

SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome

Comment9:
9-The manuscript has grammatical errors that need to be corrected.

Reply9:

We respect the dear reviewer comments. The grammatical errors have been corrected.

-In the following sentence “specimens collected from December 2020 to March 2021” during changed to from

-In the following “the” added before two: comorbidities between the two groups

-“The” added before national by the national influenza center

- “a” removed before diverse: “is a reservoir for a diverse co-circulating respiratory pathogens”

“s” removed from contributes “but also contributes to public health”

In method section:

-“were” added before “…randomly”, “the” added before “…presence”, “were” added before “…verified”, “were” added before “…tested”.

-“S” removed from “afterwards”, “of” removed from “remaining of”

-“s” added after one in “categorical one”

In result section:

-“the” added before “average”

-“Totally” removed from “Totally, men”

-“who” added before “…tested positive for SARS-CoV-2”

-“The” added before SARS-CoV-2 in the following: from those infected with the SARS-CoV-2 only

In discussion section:

-“a” added before “recent systematic review”

-“virus” changed to “other respiratory viruses

-“might rely on the patients” changed to “might be relied”

-“the” added before “spectrum”

-“RSV, IFV, hMPV was estimated to be…” changed to “RSV, IFV, hMPV were estimated to be”

-“…in Iran high rate of” changed to “…in Iran higher rate of….

-“The” added before “…high circulation of seasonal”

-“The” added before “…COVID-19 outbreak”

-“The” added before “…COVID-19 epidemic”

-“a decrease of influenza” changed to “a decrease in influenza”

-“the” added before “implementation of control strategies”

-“a” added before “…reduction in respiratory viruses”

“the” added before “viral interference”

-“the” added before “2009 IFV pandemic”

-“similar co-infection rate” changed to “ A similar co-infection rate”

In conclusion section:

-“here” added before “expand”

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 Jan 2022

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** (1) 28 Jan 2022

Dear Authors,
I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the JJM. Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department. If we need additional information from you during the production process, we will contact you directly. Please remember to always include your manuscript number, whenever inquiring about your manuscript. We will create a proof which you will be asked to check. When you receive the proof, 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
We appreciate you submitting your manuscript to JJM and hope you will consider us again for future submissions.
Regards