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.98110
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(2); e98110

Peer Review Report for "Therapeutic Effects of Ciprofloxacin Powder and Drops in Chronic Bacterial Middle Ear Infections: A Clinical Trial Study"

Author(s): Keyvan Kiakojuri, Ali Tavasoli, Roughoyeh Yunesi, Ramazan Rajabnia, Karimollah Hajian, Meghdad Bagheri, Maryam Sadat Shafiee, Mojtaba Taghizadeh Armaki, Saeid Mahdavi Omran

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	15 Sep 2019
Revised Date:	4 Mar 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 8 Feb 2020

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) — 10 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 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. 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 the point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition JJM INSTRUCTION attached to the mail, Please find it.

Note:

Please add the ORCID number to you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Please follow the 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 in chief of JJM

Hello, Thank you for consideration of our manuscript in your Journal. We edited manuscript, according to the reviewer comments. We response point to point of all comments.

Comment 1: It is suggested that the pattern of antibiotic resistance of the isolated microorganisms to ciprofloxacin be determined.
The type of preset study was clinical trial and antibiotic sensitivity testing was not our goal for this proposal, so we did not do it.

Comment 2: How much Ciprofloxacin is used in groups?
We right amount of ciprofloxacin powder in manuscript context.

Comment 3: According to Table 2, the type of isolated bacterial in the groups is not matched, which can have a significant impact on the results of the study, making it difficult to judge the efficacy of the two treatments methods.
We reduced the number of two groups to adjust type the bacterial strain, accidentally. According to this adjusting almost all of numeric details in results were changed. So, we rechecked all data. All corrections were showed as yellow hallmark in MS.

The best regard
Corresponding author: Saeid Mahdavi Omran

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 sent to the publisher for the next process.
Note:
Please add the ORCID number to you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Please follow the below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.