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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.88964
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 22(3); e88964

Peer Review Report for "Detection of *Entamoeba histolytica* Coproantigen Among Children with Dysentery in Ahvaz, Southwest Iran"

Author(s): Ahmad Shamsizadeh, Roya Nikfar, Mahmoud Rahdar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	12 Jan 2019
Revised Date:	4 Sep 2019
Accepted Date:	28 Sep 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
1- Please describe the relevant dates.
2- It is necessary that the microscopy technique is described more fully.
3- To evaluate the results of the kit, it is necessary to use positive patient samples.
4- Instead of posting the wells, please provide readings of OD's and please provide readings of standards and controls.
5- Infectious and Tropical Diseases Research Center, Health Research Institute???
6- According to current findings, there are many E.histolytica misdiagnoses in current medical diagnostic laboratories in the studied region, and the rate of E.histolytica is very low among children with dysenteric diarrhea. (Given that the diagnostic gold standard is a microscopic method, the results of the study are reversed. therefore, it is necessary for the results to confirm or reject by trichrome staining and culture of samples)
7- In the discussion, the results of the Elisa method is not mentioned
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Feb 2019

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- It seems your sample size is very low because its prevalence is low.
- Why you didn't assess specificity and sensitivity?
hanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript has been edited in an attempt to improve it, and a few suggestions/queries are marked in track change mode. The authors may go through the whole manuscript and attend the queries carefully.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 Feb 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 26 Feb 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Response To respective reviewers

All of the reviewers comments in text was corrected as below: The correction were showed by yellow highlight.

1- The cited reference does not indicate such mentioned claim

Answer: The sentences was corrected according to mentioned paper.

2- The reference is very old. For epidemiological reports, you should refer to recent references

Answer: The reference was corrected by more new ones.

3- Epidemiological reports should be written in the beginning of the introduction, rather than in a dispersed manner

Answer: This sentences located in beginning of introduction.

4- This sentence must be continued: include *Entamoeba dispar*, *Entamoeba moshkovskii* and the recently described *Entamoeba bangladeshi*

Answer: The sentences was corrected.

5- This sentrnces should be deleted Must be deleted

Answer: The sentences was corrected.

6- Trophpzpite of Entamobea maybe like to WBC and also the cited reference does not indicate such mentioned claim

Answer: The reference was corrected.

7- Which one of wavelength is selected?

Answer: the sentences was corrected.

8- The results of this study indicate that the prevalence of this disease in Iran, as mentioned in the introduction, should be corrected and updated.

Answer: The sentences were added to text.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
These items have not been answered to my judgment:
1- Please describe the relevant dates
2- It is necessary that the microscopy technique is described more fully
3- To evaluate the results of the kit, it is necessary to use positive patient samples
4- Instead of posting the wells, please provide readings of OD's and please provide readings of standards and controls
5- Infectious and Tropical Diseases Research Center, Health Research Institute???
6- According to current finding, there are many E.histolytica misdiagnoses in current medical diagnostic laboratories in the studied region and rate of E.histolytica is very low among children with dysenteric diarrhea.(Given that the diagnostic gold standard is microscopic method , the results of the study are reversed. therefore, it is necessary the results to confirm or reject by trichrome staining and culture of samples)
7- In the discussion, results of Elisa method is not mentioned)
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 8 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- The literature revive is weak, the author hasn't referred to the recent studies for Ex. this study: "Entamoeba spp. diagnosis in patients with inflammatory diarrhea by staining, copro-antigen ELISA and multiplex PCR methodsZahra Gharibi, Forough Kazemi, Mehdi Tavalla"
- The sample size is small and the claim of the author about the results of the study is the debate.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 14 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
This essay on the diagnosis of amoeba is a valuable article and the author should make some modifications to it, which is mentioned in the uploaded file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 16 Apr 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 16 Apr 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Answer to reviewers

Reviewer 1

Question: Describe the relevant dates?

.Answer: The date was corrected

?Question: It is necessary that the microscopy technique is described more fully

.Answer: The microscopic technique was described

Question: To evaluate the results of the kit, it is necessary to use positive patient .samples

Answer: There are positive samples in commercial package kit. In this test positive .samples was positive

Question: Instead of posting the wells, please provide readings of OD's and please .provide readings of standards and controls

.Answer: The figure1 was deleted and was replaced by OD's numbers

Question: Infectious and Tropical Diseases Research Center, Health Research ?Institute

Answer: This is the name of the affiliation of Infectious and Tropical Diseases Research .Center, who has approved this project

Question: According to current finding, there are many E.histolytica misdiagnoses in current medical diagnostic laboratories in the studied region and rate of E.histolytica is very low among children with dysenteric diarrhea.(Given that the diagnostic gold standard is microscopic method , the results of the study are reversed. therefore, it is necessary the results to confirm or reject by trichrome staining and culture of samples.

Answer: Because of the identification of *E.histolytica* and *E.dispar* is very difficult using by microscopic methods, it is seem that detection of specific copra antigen is more sensitive than microscopic method.

Question: In the discussion, results of Elisa method is not mentioned?

Answer: In regards to your comment about the results of ELISA technique in the discussion part, I would like draw your attention to the paragraph 2 line 3 and four of the discussion section.

Reviewer 2

Question: The literature revive is weak, the author hasn't referred to the recent studies for Ex. this study: "Entamoeba spp. diagnosis in patients with inflammatory diarrhea by staining, copro-antigen ELISA and multiplex PCR methodsZahra Gharibi, Forough Kazemi, Mehdi Tavalla"

Answer: The reference was added to text.

Question: The sample size is small and the claim of the author about the results of the study is the debate

Answer: with respect to reviewer comment, the sample size has been selected according to epidemiologist advice. The expected frequency and confidence limits was choose 7% and 5% respectively. The duration time for samples collection was 6 month.

Reviewer 3

Question: This essay on the diagnosis of amoeba is a valuable article and the author should make some modifications to it, which is mentioned in the uploaded file.

Answer: Thank you for reviewer comments, the all of comments in text were corrected.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 19 May 2019

Dear AE,
Although I personally agree with the results of the study. But it is better to refer to the specificity, sensitivity, and cross-reactions in the detection coproantigen ELISA method in the discussion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 29 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
- The sample size is so limited because the prevalence is so rare. This is a major of this study and cant use as epidemiological data. This must be considered as a limitation.
- Tittle of table 1 must be corrected.
- Abbreviation of the table must be written below the table.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 28 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
The necessary corrections have been made by the author. The only point I should add is that the optical absorption table does not need, and it is better to remove. The final result obtained by Eliza is enough.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 5 Aug 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 5 Aug 2019

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

Answer to Reviewers

Reviewer 1:

Question: Although I personally agree with the results of the study. But it is better to refer to the specificity, sensitivity and cross reactions in the detection coproantigen ELISA method in discussion.

Answer: According to respective reviewer some article were added about specificity and sensitivity of the copro antigen ELISA test. The changes were marked by yellow highlight.

Reviewer 2:
Question: The necessary corrections have been made by the author. The only point I should add is that the optical absorption table does not need, and it is better to remove. The final result obtained by Eliza is enough.

Answer: According to respective reviewer, the table 1 related to optical absorption was deleted.

Reviewer 3:
The sample size is so limited because the prevalence is so rare. This is a major of this study and can't use as epidemiological data. This must be considered as a limitation
-Tittle of table 1 must be corrected. Abbreviation of the table must be written below the table.

Answer: Yes. In current study, the sample size is smaller than other articles. In other papers the study population was selected from everybody who referred to laboratory or clinics with or without clinical signs. Therefore the collection of the samples is easier than current research. We collected the stool samples from child under 10 years old who suffered from dysenteric diarrhea during 6 months and according to comments of respective reviewer, it is a limitation of this study. This limitation was considered in paper in conclusion.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

Ali Reza Dashipour: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 27 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Alireza Bakhshipour: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 28 Sep 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (3) 28 Sep 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.