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 "**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:

Peer Review

Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jkums.99490
Published in: Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences: 24(1) ; e99490

Peer Review Report for "The Nasal Carriage of *Staphylococcus aureus* and Its Antimicrobial Susceptibility Pattern in Secondary School Students in Kurdistan Region, Iraq"

Author(s): Narin Rasheed, Nawfal Hussein

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	11 Nov 2019
Revised Date:	4 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.

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,

Thanks for your comments. We agree with all and the required changes have been made.

Regards

1-Method of sampleing is not clean. How cases included in study and sample was obtained.

Thanks for this. A paragraph about how the school and classes within schools were chosen has been added into the methods section.

2- is history of using anykinde of antibiotics is considered or exclusion criteria?

Yes, it was an exclusion criterion. This has been added. Thanks

3- How cases comumunites were choosed and which kinds of schooles were included.

Thanks for this. A paragraph about how the school and classes within schools were chosen has been added into the methods section.

4- what was limitalions in your study?

Our study has limitation. We recruited students only. This may not reflect the prevalence of the MRSA carriage in the society. Further community-based study is needed to determine the prevalence of MRSA in the society.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)