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.97176
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(8); e97176

Peer Review Report for "Reproductive Tract Infection Among Women Suffering From Rheumatoid Arthritis in India: A Clinical-Based, Cross-Sectional Study"

Author(s): Jaleh Naderi, Arvind Chopra, Renu Relwani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 22 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 31 Aug 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)

27 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
In this manuscript, the authors try to find the relation between RA and RTI in some parts of the world. Findings of the study seems to be relatively interesting however, some points must be more clarified:
Abstract:
1- Methods are not described appropriately.
2- Conclusion could be more informative and related to the results obtained
Background:
1- Is there any report about the relation between RA and other microbial infection for example Urinary tract infection (UTI)? If so it is worth mentioning in background.
Methods:
1- The tests for identification of microbes do not seem to be sufficient. Authors have to present valid references showing that the microbial identification performed as standard.
Results
1- Some of results can be presented in the form of graphs.
2- More statistical analysis can be performed and the results of statistical analysis have to

be properly presented.
Discussion:
1- The results are not appropriately compared with other studies how significant or reliable the outcomes of presented study is comparing with other studies.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 9 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
I have carefully examined the manuscript under the title " Reproductive Tract Infections among Women Suffering from Rheumatoid Arthritis, India: a Clinical-Based, Cross-Sectional Study " and my comment is following:
Comments:
1. Although the authors of the article describe the aim of the study was the examine the relationship between RTI and RA, at the end of the discussion they argue that “This study was cross-sectional in nature, so the researchers cannot infer any causal association between RTI and RA”. This seems to be one of the most important issues to discuss. That is neglected.
2. The discussion has a weak structure and needs to be rediscussed.
3. Significant of p-value must be identified (for example by *)
4. Bacteria such as Neisseria gonorrhoeae and Chlamydia trachomatis, which are known to have sexually transmitted diseases, have not been included in the study.
5. The name of the microbes should be written in italics
6. Data presented are not sufficient based on full-length paper.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 13 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
Because some essential questions are drawn by the reviewers, the manuscript can be accepted as a case report or short communication after major revisions. The novelty of work has to be explained properly and in more detail, also more discussion is required for obtained results. Methods need to be validated by proven references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 30 Nov 2019

Dear authors
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. 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 Editor and Dear Reviewers,

We highly appreciate the detailed valuable comments of you on our manuscript of “Reproductive Tract Infections among Women Suffering from Rheumatoid Arthritis, India: a Clinical-Based, Cross-Sectional Study. With Manuscript ID: 97176”. The suggestions are quite helpful for us and we incorporate them in the revised manuscript. We will detail in our response below how we plan to address your comments. All comments are repeated below and our responses inserted after each comment in highlighted letters.

Answers to Reviewer #1

1. Although the authors of the article describe the aim of the study was the examining the relationship between RTI and RA, at the end of the discussion they argue that “This study was cross-sectional in nature, so the researchers cannot infer any causal association between RTI and RA”. This seems to be one of the most important issues to discuss. That is neglected.

Response - Thank you for your kindly review.The following is a quote from our article, in background section, on the relationship between RTI and RA. Our purpose for the study is also clearly stated.

*"An understanding of the relationship between RTI and RA can provide valuable information for policy makers and health professionals who are concerned with improving the quality of life for women-especially women with chronic disease. **So**, this research has been conducted to determine prevalence and risk factors of RTIs among reproductive aged women suffering from RA"*(the word of “**so”** has been deleted in the revised paper).

The purpose of this study, as stated, is to investigate the prevalence and risk factors of RTI among women with RA. But we emphasize that understanding the relationships between RTI and RA can provide valuable information for improving the quality of life for women. We also noted in the conclusion section that *"this study could be the beginning of research into RA women as to whether RTI can be a disease associated with RA."*

2. The discussion has a weak structure and need to rediscussion.

Response - We thank the reviewer for this comment. We revised this section in the paper as suggested by the reviewer.

3. Significant of p-value must be identified (for example by *)

Response - Thanks, we did so.

4. Bacteria such as Neisseria gonorrhoeae and Chlamydia trachomatis, which are known to have sexually transmitted diseases, have not been included in the study.

Response - We agree with the reviewer. However this is essentially a clinical study and differentiates of infections was according decided with clinical gynecological examinations and Pap smear. As we did not intend identifies the specific bacterial and microbiological studies was not included.

5. The name of the microbes should be written in italics.

Response - We thank the reviewer for bringing this point to our attention. We did it.

6. Data presented are not sufficient based on full-length paper.

Response - Thank you for your careful review .The section of “results” has been revised based on that information we had.

Answers to Reviewer #2

Abstract:

1- Methods are not described appropriately.
Response - Thank you for your kindly review. We tried our best to revise methods in the abstract carefully.
2- Conclusion could be more informative and related to the results obtained.
Response - Thanks, we did so.

Background:

1- Is there any report about the relation between RA and other microbial infection for example Urinary tract infection (UTI)? If so it is worth mentioning in background.
Response - We thank the reviewer for this comment. We mentioned some reports on relation between RA and other microbial infection for example UTI in the section of background.

Methods:

1- The tests for identification of microbes do not seem to be sufficient. Authors have to present valid references showing that the microbial identification performed was standard.

Response - Thank you for your careful review. The following paragraph was added in the section of methods.
In this study, vaginal smears (wet mount) were quickly examined (gold standard) by microbiologist to diagnose RTI for community based management of RTI in developing countries. Wet mount microscopy is the direct microscopic examination of vaginal discharge for the diagnosis of *trichomoniasis*, *candidiasis* and BV (*, **). In this study diagnosis of bacterial vaginosis (BV), *candidiasis* and *trichomoniasis* was based on the patient's medical history, clinical examination with measurement of vaginal pH, whiff/KOH test and evaluation of wet mount slides.

*. Natinal guide line on prevention, management and control of reproductive tract infections including sexual transmitted infections. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare Government of India August 2007. National Rural Health Mission. Maternal Health Division. Available from:https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---ilo_aids/documents/legaldocument/wcms_117313.pdf

**. W. Frobenius and C. Bogdan. Diagnostic Value of Vaginal Discharge, Wet Mount and Vaginal pH – An Update on the Basics of Gynecologic Infectiology. Geburtshilfe Frauenheilkd. 2015 Apr; 75(4): 355–366. doi: 10.1055/s-0035-1545909

Results

1- Some of results can be presented in the form of graphs.

2- More statistical analysis can be performed and the results of statistical analysis have to be properly presented.
Response - Thanks, we did so.

Discussion:

1- The results are not appropriately compared with other studies how significant or reliable the outcomes of presented study is comparing with other studies.

Response - We thank the reviewer for this comment. We revised this section in the paper as suggested by the reviewer.

Round 2:

Funding/Support:

[Funding/Support: Not OK]

The authors should state Funding/Support on the journal website: Read more at Here

* Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".

Files Checking:

[Manuscript Files: Not OK]

Figures

The Figure(s) is(are) not mentioned in the text correctly. Please, mention all Figure in the text consecutively.

Informed Consent:

[Informed Consent: Not OK]

Authors should obtain written Informed Consent signed by the study participants or patients and should upload a copy of the Informed Consent form on the journal website. Some samples of Informed Consent can be found here.

Informed consent and other ethical considerations should be mentioned on the journal website or in the text of the manuscript: Read more at here

* Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".

Reply: Corrections added in the second round are highlighted in the text of the article with green color

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)** 25 Jul 2020

Dear Authors,

Pleases reformat all references according to JJM format. Add DOI, PubMed ID, PMCID ID as follow:

Youssef SS, Abbas EAE, Mostafa A, el Zanaty T, Seif SM. Association of IL28B polymorphism with fibrosis, liver inflammation, gender respective natural history of hepatitis C virus in Egyptian patients with genotype 4. J Interf Cytok Res. 2014;34(1):22–7. doi: 10.1089/jir.2013.0036. [PubMed: 23981065].

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.

Dear Professor Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi

Journal: undishapur Journal of Microbiology

First of all, the present research team has special thanks to you for taking the time to read our work carefully and also the valuable comments that respectful reviewer has made to improve our paper. Every change made in response to their comments and all proposed changes applied in a clean version of the manuscript by the authors as below:

With kind regards

Reviewer

Dear auteurs

Pleases reformat all references according to JJM format. Add DOI, PubMed ID, PMCID ID as follow:

Youssef SS, Abbas EAE, Mostafa A, el Zanaty T, Seif SM. Association of IL28B polymorphism with fibrosis, liver inflammation, gender respective natural history of hepatitis C virus in Egyptian patients with genotype 4. J Interf Cytok Res. 2014;34(1):22–7. doi: 10.1089/jir.2013.0036. [PubMed: 23981065].

Reply from author to reviewer: Dear reviewer, thank you for your valuable comment, yes, as you can check, according to your comment, we changed the refrences in the main manuscript.

Thanks

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) 31 Aug 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.
Thanks