Gene, Cell and Tissue
Volume 10 · Issue 2 · e132228

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Frequency of Cytolethal Distending Toxin Genes in *Escherichia coli* Isolates from Bovine Mastitis in Tabriz City in 2020

Saman Mahdavi, Masoumeh Salimi, Jafar Rahmani Kahnamoei

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18 Oct 2022 | 31 Jan 2023 | 7 Feb 2023 | 10.5812/gct-132228 |

## 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, Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor ..... 3
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 4
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 5

## 1 Original submission

3 comments · 24 Oct 2022 – 1 Nov 2022

### Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 24 Oct 2022

This manuscript considered many key aspects of article writing but could be improved as follows:
- Please complete the table titles so that they cover the main parts of your study title.
- Don't start a line with a number. Use "The" before numbers.
- In research articles, it is better to separate the Discussion and Conclusion. In the Discussion, you can compare your results with those of other studies.

- Please expand your Discussion.

### Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 31 Oct 2022

Dear Authors
1- The DNA extraction method is not explained.
2- The manufacturer of the materials used is not stated.
3- In Figure 1, from numbers 4 to 15, only 6 samples were positive for Escherichia coli (about 50%). How was the gene examined in 96 samples? The total number of samples was 100.
4- The discussion section was poorly written. Please review the discussion and conclusions.

### Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 1 Nov 2022

Based on the reviewers' comments and my reading of the manuscript, major revisions and a point-by-point response to the comments are needed.

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.

Reviewer 1:

We edited and completed the title of the table that you had requested. Based on the format of the journal, the discussion and conclusion section should be integrated and unified. The discussion section was expanded further. The changed parts are highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer 2:

The DNA extraction method was fully explained.  The manufacturer company of the materials used is stated. Typographical error in the text and figure caption was corrected. The discussion section was expanded further. The changed parts are highlighted in yellow.

## 2 Revision 1

3 comments · 1 Feb 2023 – 6 Feb 2023

### Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 1 Feb 2023

All comments have been addressed by the authors.
Accept

### Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 2 Feb 2023

This manuscript is acceptable.

### Associate Editor

ACCEPT 6 Feb 2023

Dear Author,
After the review process, I can recommend the manuscript for publication in its current form.
Sincerely,