

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>



Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases

Article DOI: [10.5812/archcid.90861](https://doi.org/10.5812/archcid.90861)

Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 16(1); e90861

Peer Review Report for "Possible Association and Risk Factors of *Blastocystis* Infection and Colorectal Cancers in Western Iran"

Author(s): Hossein Mahmoudvand, Akram Sepahvand, Ebrahim Badparva, Mehrdad Khatami, Massumeh Niazi, Alireza Moayyedkazemi

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	23 Feb 2019
▶ Revised Date:	27 Oct 2020
▶ Accepted Date:	8 Nov 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)


29 Oct 2019

Dear AE,

The current study presents "Possible association and risk factors of *Blastocystis* infection and colorectal cancers in Western Iran". This study has several major concerns that affect the acceptance of this article and should be addressed by the authors.

- 1- It seems that the sample size for the description of this assumption was not enough.
- 2- The molecular methods are necessary to show a definitive diagnosis of *Blastocystis* infection and its strains.
- 3- In exclusion criteria, the viral/bacterial infections causing colorectal cancers have not mentioned!!
- 4- Page 3, last line; correct the "*Opisthorchis viverrini* and *Clonorchis sinensis*"!!!!
- 5- Please update the reference by Iranian researchers;
 - a- Karamati et al(2019) Comprehensive Study of Phenotypic and Growth Rate Features of *Blastocystis* Subtypes 1-3 and 6 in Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Subjects.
 - b- Esteghamati et al., (2019) Prevalence of Intestinal Parasitic Infection in Cancer, Organ 5-Transplant and Primary Immunodeficiency Patients in Tehran, Iran.
- 6- *Blastocystis hominis* correct to italic format in the legend of table 2.

Thanks.

 **REFEREE:** Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

6 Jul 2020

Dear AE,

The article is well presented and the result is valuable for further investigation and deserves to be published.

While thanking the authors for their research, I would like to draw their attention to the following points:

- 1) Summarize the first paragraph in the introduction.
 - 2) The result is valuable but some grammar and punctuation errors were observed.
- The article is well presented and
- 3) Some grammar and punctuation errors were observed.
 - 4) Please revise the references and use newer references.
 - 5) Please all possible risk factors mentioned.
 - 6) Direct methods alone without culturing and molecular methods have no diagnostic value for diagnosing Blastocystis.
 - 7) Please author add the more method in order to diagnostic if they did.

Thanks.

 **REFEREE:** Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

27 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

 **REFEREE:** EIC | **Revision (0)**

27 Sep 2020

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.

Reviewer 1:

1) Summarize the first paragraph in the introduction.

Revision was made in the text.

2) The result is valuable but some grammar and punctuation errors were observed.

Revisions were made in the text.

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

While thanking the authors for their research, I would like to draw their attention to the following points:

1) Some grammar and punctuation errors were observed.

Revisions were made in the text.

2) Please revise the references and use newer references.

3) Please all possible risk factors mentioned.

Revisions were made in the text.

4) Direct methods alone without culturing and molecular methods have no diagnostic value for diagnosing of Blastocystis.

PCR Method was added to the text.

5) Please author add the more method in order to diagnostic if they did.

PCR Method was added to the text.

Reviewer 2:

1-It seems that the sample size for the description of this assumption was not enough.

The authors should be thankful for your valuable comments. However, we can just access to these patients.

2-The molecular methods are necessary to show definitive diagnosis of Blastocystis infection and its strains.

PCR Method was added to the text.

3-In exclusion criteria, the viral/bacterial infections causing colorectal cancers have not mentioned!!

Revision was added to the text

4-Page 3, last line; correct the "Opisthorchis viverrini and Clonorchis sinensis"!!!!

Revision was added to the text

5- Please update the reference by Iranian researchers;

a- Karamati et al(2019) Comprehensive Study of Phenotypic and Growth Rate Features of Blastocystis Subtypes 1-3 and 6 in Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Subjects.

b-Esteghamati et al., (2019) Prevalence of Intestinal Parasitic Infection in Cancer, Organ 5-Transplant and Primary Immunodeficiency Patients in Tehran, Iran.

References were added.

6- Blastocystis hominis correct to italic format in the legend of table 2.

Revision was added to the 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.

 **Masoud Mardani:** EIC | **Revision (1)**

8 Nov 2020

Dear Author,

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

Thanks.