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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.97397
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(1); e97397

Peer Review Report for "*PNPLA3* and *TM6SF2*, but Not *MBOAT7*, Are Associated with Steatosis and HBV Viral Persistence in Pakistani Population"

Author(s): Ismail Jalil, Muhammad Arshad, Shahtaj Khan, Javid Iqbal Dasti

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 17 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 20 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Maryam Fazeli: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 19 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
In this paper entitled “PNPLA3 and TM6SF2, but not MBOAT7 are associated with steatosis and HBV viral persistence in Pakistani population” the authors investigated PNPLA3 rs738409 and TM6SF2 rs58542926 but not MBOAT rs641738 a risk variant for HBV persistence and steatosis in Pakistani population. Based on their findings, they proposed for the first time that polymorphisms in PNPLA3 and TM6SF2, but not MBOAT7 are associated with steatosis and HBV viral clearance in Pakistani population.
Thanks.

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

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

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

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 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.

17th February 2020

Prof. Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi
Editor-in-Chief, Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Dear Prof.Törüner

Thank you for revising our manuscript (**ID: 97397**) **"*PNPLA3* and *TM6SF2*, but not *MBOAT7* are associated with steatosis and HBV viral persistence in Pakistani population."**

We thank the Editors and reviewers for their constructive comments. We have found the suggestions helpful and have incorporated them in the manuscript, which we now feel is substantially improved.

Please find accompanying a point-by-point response to the editor's comments, as well as the revised manuscript. Thank you for your further review. We hope that the revised manuscript will be acceptable to the Editorial team in due time.

Yours sincerely

Ismail Jalil

Reviewer 1

- Please change dot place after reference

Response: We apologies for typing mistake. In agreement, we have added the requested information.

-The study was conducted in which year?

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. In agreement, we have added the study period.

-Do not start the sentence by an abbreviation

Response: We apologies for typing mistake. In agreement, we have undertaken the requested changes.

-Where is hear? north, west …

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. In agreement, we have specified the location.

-If you set the PCR please explain about the PCR program and prob/primers or if you choose it from an article refer to it.

Response: We respectfully would like to note that we chose the probe from other article. In agreement we have incorporated the 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)** 20 Feb 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 below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.