Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Volume 19 · Issue 3 · e145826

OPEN PEER REVIEW

An Outbreak of Pan-drug Resistant *Providencia* Species in an Intensive Care Unit: A Case-Series

Fahimeh Hadavand, Seyyed Rahim Naseri, Masoud Mardani, Payam Tabarsi, Amirreza Keyvanfar, Latif Gachkar, Simin Dokht Shoaei, Kouros Aghazade

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
21 Feb 2024	26 Apr 2024	12 May 2024	10.5812/archcid-145826

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, Referee 2 2
2 **Revision 1** 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

2 comments · 4 Apr 2024 – 22 Apr 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 4 Apr 2024

Dear editor in chief
The aforementioned paper has been reviewed. The title " An Outbreak of Pan-drug Resistant Providencia Species in an Intensive Care Unit:A Case-series" is interesting, but the paper is not written in the correct style. First, it is a report of an outbreak at a single hospital. There was no proposal and no calculated sample size, so it is not a research article; it is a case (outbreak) report.
In the methods
The clinical samples are not mentioned, and there is no demographic information or patient history. The isolation of patients based on the IPC committee's recommendations is mentioned, as is repeat sampling, such as UC and BC, in addition to sampling from the ICU environment. In this part, the types of clinical samples and the methods are not mentioned.
In results
The histories and clinical samples of all 14 included patients are described, and at the end of each part, the result for the detected bacteria (Providencia spp.) is mentioned.
Note: there are no results for bacteria isolated from the environment, nor is there any information on sampling, methods for bacterial isolation in the laboratory, or methods and protocols for AST. However, table 2 presents AST results for 14 Providencia isolates.
In discussion
Similar studies are mentioned, but there is no discussion of Providencia spp. isolated from the environment, as there are no data on this in the methods and results.
Conclusion
Must be related to the results of this study and mention the achievements of this study.
References
Need to be revised, standardized, and corrected according to the journal style.

For more information, please kindly find the enclosed.
Regards

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 22 Apr 2024

Dear editor

The manuscript entitled “An Outbreak of Pan-drug Resistant Providencia Species in an Intensive Care Unit:” is a valuable report about an epidemic of Providencia and control measures to contain it.
In my opinion, the strength of this manuscript is its description of appropriate and quick steps and measures to control the epidemic, but it would have been better if the methods used for accurate diagnosis of Providencia had been explained in more detail and more completely in the methods section.
In the results section, given the small number of patients, including a complete biography of each patient was an interesting way of presenting the results and provided valuable information to the reader.
But it would have been better if, based on patient information such as age and underlying diseases, the role of these factors in the patients’ final recovery had been considered and discussed.
In the discussion section, it would be better if more studies on Providencia epidemics and control measures

in similar cases were presented and discussed.
Overall, the conclusion is appropriate and useful.

Regards

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.

Dear editor and reviewers,

I would like to thank you for the time and energy you spent on the peer-review. Based on your constructive comments, the manuscript was revised. Furthermore, below I answered your comments one by one. I hope that the revised version of the manuscript will be suitable for publication.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1

Dear editor

The manuscript entitled “An Outbreak of Pan-drug Resistant Providencia Species in an Intensive Care Unit” is a valuable report about an epidemic of Providencia and control measures to contain it. In my opinion the strength of this manuscript is to mention appropriate and quick steps and measures to control the epidemic but it would have been better if in the methods section, the accurate diagnosis methods of providencia were explained in more detail and more completely.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We added detailed methods for diagnosing Providencia spp. to the method section.

In the results section, due to the small number of patients, having a complete biography of each patient was an interesting way of writing of the results and gives valuable information to the reader. But it would have been better if according to the information of the patients, such as factors such as age and underlying diseases, the role of these factors in the final recovery of the patients would have been considered and discussed.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We added a paragraph to the discussion section elucidating the abovementioned issue.

In the discussion section, it would be better if more researches on Providencia epidemic and control measures in similar cases were brought and discussed. Overall, the conclusion is appropriate and useful.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. This issue is added to the discussion section.

Reviewer 2

Dear editor in chief

The aforementioned paper is reviewed. The title" An Outbreak of Pan-drug Resistant Providencia Species in an Intensive Care Unit:A Case-series" is interesting but the paper is not written in correct style. At first, it is a report study of an outbreak of a single hospital. So, there were no proposal and no calculated sample size so it is not a research article it is a kind of cases (outbreak) report.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We had previously submitted our manuscript as a case-series to the journal. Technical checking of the journal did not approve it in that format and suggested us to resubmit it as an original article. Thus, it leads to a discrepancy between the context of the manuscript and its general style.

In the methods, it is not mentioned to the clinical samples and there is no any demographic and history of patients. Also, it is mentioned to the isolation of patients based on IPC committee also re sampling such as UC and BC. Beside to sampling from ICU environment. In this part it is not mentioned to the type of clinical samples and also the methods.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. Since our manuscript was a case-series it had no inclusion or exclusion criteria to be mentioned in the method section. Instead, we described comprehensively the demographic and clinical features of them in Table 1. Also, we added a paragraph explaining the method of *Providencia* species isolation to the method section. Additionally, type of clinical samples are mentioned in Table 1 (site of isolation).

In results, the history of all 14 included patients and clinical samples were explained and at the end of each part the result of detected bacteria (Providencia spp) is mentioned.

Note: there is no any result of environments isolated bacteria as well as there is no any information of sampling and no any method of bacterial laboratory isolation and also any method

and protocol of AST. However, in table 2, it is mentioned to AST results of 14 isolated providencia.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We added a paragraph to the result section, describing result of environments isolated bacteria and resampling. Also, protocol of AST is mentioned in the method section.

In discussion, it is mentioned to same similar studies but there is no any discussion about isolated providencia spp. from environment as there is no any data in methods and results in this step.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We added some sentences discussing about isolated providencia spp. from environment to the discussion section.

Conclusion

must be related to the results of this study and mention to the achievements of this study.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We revised the conclusion to be more related to the results of this study.

References

Need to revise and unify and correct based on the journal style.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. References are checked to be unified on the journal style.

Regards

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.