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.95445
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(1); e95445

Peer Review Report for "Identification and Detection of Pathogenic Bacteria in Adenoid Tissue of Adenoidectomized Children: Emergence of *Staphylococcus aureus* as the Most Prevalent Pathogen"

Author(s): Gholamabas Sabz, Sedighe Moradi, Asghar Sharifi, Mohsen Naghmachi, Marzie Taheripour Sisakht, Seyed Sajjad Khoramrooz

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	16 Jun 2019
Revised Date:	26 Feb 2020
Accepted Date:	4 Mar 2020

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) 18 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Based on reviewing the manuscript it seems the below comments should be considered.
1- The keywords should be rechecked based on the MeSH format.
2- Some parts of the material and method needs more detailed information. For example, the PCR part needs data regarding primer design and preparation as well as optimization procedures.
3- The result part should be rechecked and relevant data should be included based on the material and method part.
4- Discussion needs to be written based on relevant research in other countries.
5-Most of the references is outdated and should be replaced with the most recent (5 years) and current references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript has no new idea and this manuscript published in many years old in text and journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Mentioned manuscript accepted by reviewers with major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Feb 2020

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 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 point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition JJM INSTRUCTION attached to 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 below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/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.

Dear Reviewers

Thank you very much for your comments about our article.

We tried to answer to your comments according toour data and information and we edited the text according to the comments.

Best Regard.

Answers to the questions are listed below:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 2:
Dear Editor in chief,
Based on reviewing the manuscript it seems the below comments should be considered.
1- The keywords should be rechecked based on the MeSH format.

The key words revised according to the reviewer comment and entered in text.

2- Some parts of the material and method needs more detailed information. For example, the PCR part needs data regarding primer design and preparation as well as optimization procedures.

The primer sequences used in this study added to article as a Table 1.

3- The result part should be rechecked and relevant date should be included based on the material and method part.

The result section was revised based on the reviewer comment

4- Discussion needs to be written based on relevant research in other countries.

We searched for new paper and nearly all the paper relevant to our study were included in the text and we compare and discussed our result with other countries.

5-Most of the references is outdated and should be replaced with most recent (5 years) and current references.

Three new references were added to the text and we deleted two old references.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 4 Mar 2020

Dear Authors,
According to the associated editor report, your manuscript is accepted for publishing in JJM and send to the publisher for the next process.
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. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.