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.91416
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 21(4); e91416

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Sensitivity and Specificity of Native ELISA Test (Prepared in Khouzestan, Iran) and Commercial ELISA Kit in the Diagnosis of Human Hydatidosis"

Author(s): Maryam Fasihi Karami, Sharif Maraghi, Abdollah Rafiei, Seyed Mahmoud Latifi, Gholam Abbas Kaydani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Mar 2019
Revised Date:	11 May 2019
Accepted Date:	17 Jun 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) — 17 Mar 2019

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 28 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
It's interesting manuscript about the Comparison of Sensitivity And Specificity of Native ELISA Test (Prepared in Khouzestan, Iran) And Commercial ELISA Kit in Diagnosis of Human Hydatidosis.
The paper is good organised and well written. However, could you define healthy people that you select as a control group? How are you sure these people are healthy?
Regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 May 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 May 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 (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 reviewer of Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences (ZJRMS)

In response to your question, I would like to point out that the control group individuals were from the referrals to the laboratory, who according to the results of immunological tests, hematology, biochemistry, hormone and liver were normal and healthy. According to the age and gender, those who were closer to other groups were selected.
Thank you for your attention.

Sharif Maraghi
Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Medicine, Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences

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) 12 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for their discussion. I agree to publication.
Regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 Jun 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.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 Jun 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.