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

Gene, Cell and Tissue
Article DOI: 10.5812/gct.112377
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: In Press(In Press); e112377

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, Producing Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamase (ESBLs) from Clinical Specimen in Khuzestan, Iran"

Author(s): Sahar Besharati Zadeh, Pegah Shakib, Mohammad Reza Zolfaghari, Ahmad Farajzadeh Sheikh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 26 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 6 Feb 2021

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) — 11 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript is suitable but the authors should to do some correction I put the comments for authors.
1- Please add more information in the introduction part it is too short.
2- In the introduction part after reference 12 write the first letter of the word in capital.
3- In line 56 some words are in capital form in the sentence write all of them in lowercase.
Thanks.

Maryam Shahsavari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The review of the article is as follows and should be considered by the authors:
1- It is better to record the ethical code of the study in the materials and methods section
2- In Results, line 92 Modify as follows:
pneumonia was related to the Intensive care unit(ICU) and emergency room, and most

strains were …
3- Discussion modify as follows:
Line 134: coli and K. pneumonia isolate greatly differs worldwide for …
line 139: 69.4% in Paris (27) and 41.6% in India (28)
Line 155: the strategy of antibiotic therapy use to prevent the transmission
4- In the discussion section, the causes of differences in the results of the articles should be further investigated
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Reviewers have now commented on this paper. The authors will see that they are advising that the authors should revise their manuscript. If they are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.
The revision is due by 30/01/ 2021.
To submit a revision, go to http://genecelltissue.com/en/index.html and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.
Yours sincerely

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 23 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewers and AE comments and as I read, this manuscript needs minor revisions and reply to the comments point by point.
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

I would like to thank you for your kind attention to the study. We have tried to edit the manuscript according to your comments and we hope that we will be able to satisfy you. Reforms include:

1- Added more information in introduction part.
2- In introduction part after reference 12 edited the first letter of the word in capital.
3- In line 56 some words are in capital form in the sentence edited all of them in lowercase.

4- The present article was taken from the dissertation of a graduate student of Qom branch, and because the bacteria and sample information were received from the hospital and we had no contact with the patient, the university stated in the proposal approval process that there was no need for an ethical code.
5-in Results ,line 92 edited
"pneumoniae was related to the Intensive care unit(ICU) and emergency room, and most strains were "…
6- Line 134 edited "coli and K. pneumonia isolates greatly differs in worldwide for …
7- line 139 edited" 69.4% in Paris (27) and 41.6% in India (28)
8- Line 155 edited" the strategy of antibiotic therapy use to prevent the transmission
4-In the discussion section, the causes of differences in the results of the articles described.

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) — 30 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The authors did all comments exactly and now the manuscript is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

Maryam Shahsavari: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 31 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
This article has been reviewed. Thank you for doing all the necessary corrections.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 6 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 6 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
Revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thnaks.