Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Volume 17 · Issue 2 · e122410

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Effects of *Thymus vulgaris* and *Cinnamomum verum* Essential Oils on *bap* and *ica* Gene Expression in *Staphylococcus aureus*

fatemeh noorbakhsh, parisa Rahmati

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24 Jan 2022 | 9 Aug 2022 | 9 Aug 2022 | 10.5812/archcid-122410 |

## About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

## Contents

1 Original submission Referee 1 ..... 2
2 Revision 1 ..... 3
Authors' reply to reviewers ..... 4
Reviewer and editor comments ..... 5

## 1 Original submission

1 comment · 2 Aug 2022

### Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Aug 2022

1. The manuscript's style and language require very serious attention. The authors should seek the assistance of a professional scientific English editing service. The resubmitted manuscript should be accompanied by the service's certificate.
2. For all companies, provide the company name, city, state (if in the USA, use the two-letter abbreviation), and country at first mention.
3. The authors should have a table with the clinical information for all the isolates, such as the origin and the disease. . .. It is really confusing how they selected the clinical isolates.
4. What are the positive controls for the icaA, icaD, and bap genes?
5. The frequency of the Bap gene is very low. I am surprised—how did the authors investigate it?
6. In the Materials and Methods section, the bap gene was explained, but in the results section I do not see related results.
4. What is the method for evaluating anti-biofilm activity? And how confident are the authors that biofilm changes are related to thyme essential oils?
7. The Discussion should be revised. The discussion does nothing more than compare their data to previous studies in a list-like fashion. It is unclear what these new data bring to the table that was not available previously.
8. The Conclusion is not aligned with the goal of the study and should be completely revised.

2

# Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

## 2 Revision 1

0 comments

*No public comments in this round.*