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.96945
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 15(2); e96945

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Fecal Carriage of Extended-Spectrum β-Lactamase-Producing Enterobacteriaceae Among School Children in South Sulawesi, Indonesia"

Author(s): Firdaus Hamid, Munawir Munawir, Aldian Irma Amaruddin, Bramantyas Kusuma Hapsari, Andi Rofian Sultan, Dianawaty Amiruddin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 18 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 17 Apr 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)

12 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Cefotaxime (CTX-M), temoneira (TEM), and sulfyhydril (SHV) change to Cefotaximases (CTX-M), temoniera (TEM), and sulfhydryl variable (SHV).
- Please add keywords based on MESH.
- “bla” in the name of genes should be in italic form.
- Please add the percentage and number in the abstract.
- What is the reference for bacterial detection?
- CAT No. and the producer company names for used materials has not been mentioned.
- The standard strain number should be added in the methods and materials (for ESBL).
- Why MIC was not performed according to CLSI guidelines?.
- Sequencing method should perform to confirm the PCR accuracy.
- Statistical analysis should be added to the manuscript.
- The discussion is poorly written.
- The article type is shot communication.

Best regards.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for submission of this article:
There are some notes:
Totally this article has valuable information on the resistance pattern of enteobacteriacea but there are grammatical problems and some sentences are confusing.
1- Introduction: the sentence “From a number of Enterobacteriaceae in various communities in the world have been identified gram-negative bacteria that produce ESBL” is confusing.
2- Objective: In the sentence” This study aims to investigate the prevalence of transport of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae among school children in South Sulawesi, Indonesia.” This study is not going to investigate the transportation of resistance but this is a study on the prevalence of ESBL gene in organisms.
3- Site and sampling:
4- Was the study was performed at one school or more than one, the sampling method cannot be voluntary, what was the characteristic of samples, did they have previous problems, using antibiotic or not, and what was their age range.
5- Discussion: a big part of text has one reference please check it. Please describe what are your reason of the similarity of your results with the other author’s results. Please give other examples of countries from different places of the world with different socioeconomic statuses or other medical practices.
6- Please give a table to show the epidemiologic results with resistance genes
7- Did the author confirmed the organisms phenotypically?
8- Please separate the conclusion part.
Best thanks

Bita Pourkaveh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 2019

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,

Masoud Mardani: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 2019

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

Reply to reviewers

Manuscript ID: ID: 96945

Manuscript Title: Prevalence of faecal carriage of extended-spectrum β-lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae among school children in South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Thankyou for the opportunity to address the comments from the Reviewers and the Committee members. The authors hope that the Reviewers and Editors will be satisfied with the further amendments which we have made to the manuscript after taking on board the feedback.

Reviewer 1:

1. *Introduction: the sentence "From a number of Enterobacteriaceae in various communities in the world have been identified gram-negative bacteria that produce ESBL" is confusing.*
   - Several *Enterobacteriaceae* in communities in the world have been identified as gram-negative bacteria that produce ESBL.

2. *Objective: in sentence" This study aims to investigate the prevalence of transport of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae among school children in South Sulawesi, Indonesia." This study is not going to investigate the transportation of resistance but this is a study on the prevalence of ESBL gene in organisms.*
   - This study aims to investigate the prevalence of ESBL-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* among school children in South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

3. *Site and sampling: Were the study was performed one school or more than one, sampling method cannot be voluntarily, what was the characteristic of samples, did they have previous problems, using antibiotic or not and what was their age range.*
   - Okay, we used simple random sampling. And all the criteria we already added in inclusion and exclusion criteria.
4. *Discussion: a big part of text has one reference please check it. Please describe what are your reason of similarity of your results with other author's results. Please give other examples of countries from different places of world with different socioeconomic status or other medical practices.*
   - We will added a some research from different socioeconomic status
5. *Please give a table to show the epidemiologic results with resistance genes*
   - Table 1 already show the epidemiologic results that ESBL positive is 76,7% and each type of ESBL-gene
6. *Did the author confirmed the organisms phenotypically?*
   - In this research, the authors did not confirm the organisms phenotypically, because we directly analyzed genotypes using primer gene-specific *Enterobacteriaceae*. The others reason why we don't do a culture because we are afraid that overgrowth will occur because the sample that we process is not directly done because it comes from a district that has quite a distance from the laboratory.
7. *Please separate the conclusion part.*

- We already separate the conclusion at below the discussion

Conclusion

We have shown that Indonesia is another developing country situated in the Southeast Asian region, especially South Sulawesi, Indonesia that is affected by the spread of bacterial isolates harboring ESBL genes within the clinical and community environment. In conclusion, the presence of detected ESBL gene careers suggests that antibiotic resistance has spread in the community so this needs to be of concern as it can be an ESBL gene reservoir that can be transmitted to many pathogenic bacteria.

Reviewer 2:
Dear editor,

1. *cefotaxime (CTX-M), temoneira (TEM), and sulfyhydril (SHV) change to Cefotaximases (CTX-M), temoniera (TEM), and sulfhydryl variable (SHV).*
   - We already have replaced the use of the words genes CTX-M, TEM, SHV
2. *Please add keywords based on MESH.*
   - we already find a keywords based on MESH : children, enterobacteriaceae, extended spectrum β-Lactamase, genotypes, polymerase chain reaction
3. *“bla” in the name of genes should be in italic form.*
   - We already have edited a “bla” in italic form
4. *Please add the percentage and number in the abstract.*
   - We already added the number and percentage in the abstract.
5. *What is the reference for bacterial detection?*
   - We didn’t detected a specific bacteria in this research, but we assumed all of samples was *Ent*eobacteriaceae group, because we directly analyzed genotypes using primer gene-specific *Enterobacteriaceae*.
6. *CAT No. and the producer company names for used materials has not been mentioned.*
   - We already added the producer company names from all materials in methods.
7. *The standard strain number should be added in the methods and materials (for ESBL).*
   - We didn’t used specific strain number from ESBL gene, only general TEM, CTX-M, SHV primer gene was performed.
8. *Why MIC was not performed according to CLSI guidelines?.*
   - We were not performed step by step using CLSI guidelines, because we only seen in genotpyes from communities.
9. *Sequencing method should perform to confirm the PCR accuracy.*
   - This research was a pilot study, because the authors want to know generally prevalence of ESBL producing Enterobacteriaceae in Indonesia, especially South Sulawesi as a generally. Yes, we will continuous this research with a next step using sequencing method for the accuracy.

10. Statistical analysis should be added to the manuscript.
    - The generated data was analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25.0 to give descriptive statistics which included frequencies and percentages.
11. *The discussion is poorly written.*
    - Thankyou for your advice, we will try the best writing soon.

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)** 17 Apr 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.