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.99379
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(1); e99379

Peer Review Report for "Quantitative Assessment of an Artificial Neural Network for the Variation in Immunity to *Salmonella* Infection Among Sudanese and Chinese Populations and the Relationship Between HLA-DQB1 and Antibody: A Preliminary Study"

Author(s): Abdelhakam G. Tamomh, Hui Liu

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 14 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 18 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 12 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
In this paper, the authors intend to determine the relationship between three quantitative variables (antibody levels, antibody activity, and protein content) to the five qualitative variables (HLA-DQB1 alleles). In addition, they compare these relationships between the two nationalities.
The paper needs a major revision.
- The introduction needs to revise. Please explain the reasons for using RBF and classify RBF's results.
- The sample values are smaller than sample values appropriate for population studies hence, please change the title.

- In materials and methods, please bring a description of the detection of antibody levels, antibody activity, and protein contents.
- In the results section, please bring the primary results of the detection of quantitative variables and qualitative variables in the tables or graphs for each nationality. In another subtitle, determine the relationship between qualitative and quantitative variables in each nationality. In the last subtitle, please bring the results of RBF and the relation between quantitative variables and qualitative variables in two nationalities.
- The discussion needs to revise.
- Please the authors change the references of HLA DQB1 for the clearance of salmonella instead of the hepatitis B virus.
Thanks.

Zohreh Mashak: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
- Results: what are the results of the detection of quantitative variables and qualitative data(tables & graphs) for Chinese and Sudanese groups?.
- Discussion and Introduction: must be edited and revised, and also; describe and type the application of RBF in other studies. (with reference)
Thanks.

Zohreh Mashak: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
- Results: what are the results of the detection of quantitative variables and qualitative data(tables & graphs) for Chinese and Sudanese groups? In the last subtitle, please bring the results of RBF and the relation between quantitative variables and qualitative variables in two nationalities.
- Discussion and Introduction: must be edited and revised, and describe an application of RBF in other studies
- Please the authors change the references of HLA DQB1 for the clearance of salmonella instead of the hepatitis B virus.
Thanks.

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 is 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,

Thank you for your review of our manuscript (Manuscript ID: 99379). We appreciate the concerns and suggestions provided by Reviewer 1, and Reviewer 2, and have revised our manuscript accordingly. Our point-by-point responses are provided below, and the new or modified texts are highlighted in the revised manuscript.

Upon review of our revised manuscript, we hope that you will find it acceptable for publication in **Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology**, and we look forward to your response.

***Responses to the suggestions of reviewer 1**

In this paper, the authors intend to determine the relationship between three quantitative variables (antibody levels, antibody activity, and protein content) to the five qualitative variables (HLA-DQB1 alleles). In addition, they compare these relationships between the two nationalities.

The paper needs a major revision.

1- The introduction needs to revise. Please explain the reasons for using RBF and classify RBF's results.

Answer: As suggested the introduction has been revised and the reasons for using RBF neural network and RBF results has been explained. (see line 65-69)

2- The sample values are smaller than sample values appropriate for population studies hence, please change the title.

Answer: As suggested, the title has been modified. (see line 1-4)

3- In materials and methods, please bring a description of the detection of antibody

levels, antibody activity, and protein contents.

Answer: As suggested, the detection of antibody levels, antibody activity, and protein contents has been described and new sentences added. (see line 97-125)

4- In the results section, please bring the primary results of the detection of quantitative variables and qualitative variables in the tables or graphs for each nationality. In another subtitle, determine the relationship between qualitative and quantitative variables in each nationality. In the last subtitle, please bring the results of RBF and the relation between quantitative variables and qualitative variables in two nationalities.

Answer: As suggested the primary results of the detection of quantitative variables and qualitative variables for each nationality have been added and expressed in graphs(see line 168-196). In addition, as suggested the determination of the relationship between qualitative and quantitative variables in each nationality has explained.(see line 199-230). In last subtitle, as suggested RBF and the relation between quantitative variables and qualitative variables in two nationalities have been explained.(see line 235-291).

5- The discussion needs to revise.

Answer: As suggested the discussion has been revised.

6- Please change the references of HLA DQB1 for the clearance of salmonella instead of the hepatitis B virus.

Answer: As suggested the references of HLA-DQB1 for the clearance of *salmonella* has been changed. (see line 472-478).

***Responses to the suggestions of reviewer 2**

1- Results: what is the results of the detection of quantitative variables and qualitative data(tables & graphs) for Chinese and Sudanese groups?.

Answer: As suggested, the results of the detection of quantitative variables and qualitative data for Chinese and Sudanese groups have been added. (see line 168-196).

2- Discussion and Introduction: must be edit and revise, and also; describe and type the application of RBF in other studies.(with reference)

Answer: As suggested, the discussion and introduction have been modified and revised. Also, the application type of RBF in other studies has been explained (see line 70-73), and new references have been added (see line 507-521).

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)** 18 Feb 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.