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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.92032
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(3); e92032

Peer Review Report for "High Frequency of qnr Genes in Urinary Isolates of Extended-Spectrum β-Lactamase (ESBL)-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Tehran, Iran"

Author(s): Reza Abossedgh, Maryam Ghane, Laleh Babaeekhou

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Apr 2019
Revised Date: 10 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 12 Aug 2019

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) — 31 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1) The article needs some correction in spells such as “gentimicine “in the 2nd paragraph of the result.
2) Discussion needs more clinical relevant take-home message for.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 1 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
- There is a need for editing.
- The discussion should be more clinically focused.
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 professor Kamran Bagheri Lankarani

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to improve the manuscript entitled" High frequency of *qnr* genes in urinary isolates of Extended-Spectrum β-Lactamase (ESBL)-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Tehran, Iran". It should be mentioned that the manuscript was revised according to the reviewer and Editorial Boards' Comments as follows:

The spell of gentamicin *in 2nd paragraph of result* was corrected

The discussion was improved and more clinically focused according to reviewers' Comments.

Best regards

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)** 12 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.