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.93161
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 6(3); e93161

Peer Review Report for "Investigating the Frequency of *Klebsiella* Infection and Drug Resistance Among Inpatients and Outpatients Referring to Amir Al-Momenin Hospital, Gerash, Iran"

Author(s): Aliyar Pirouzi, Hossain Foruozandeh, Abbas Farahani, Zahra Forouzandeh, Iraj Ahmadi, Rahman Abdizadeh, Mojtaba Kalantar, Hadi Kalantar, Mojtaba Azadbakht

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 May 2019
Revised Date: 12 Jun 2019
Accepted Date: 25 Jun 2019

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) 19 May 2019

Dear AE,
In general, the article is good and requires more and Newer references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 May 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. The title is appropriate.
2. In the abstract, the first sentence should be semantically changed.
3. In the abstract, in the materials and methods section, the type of samples should be written .
(For example, Klebsiella is isolated from the urine, blood, stool and ...)
4. In abstract, in the results section. The percentage of bacterial resistance to various antibiotics is better to write pvalue.

5. Keywords should be written based on the mesh system.
6. The volume of the introduction is high, it should be revised.
7. In the materials and methods, the specifications of the culture media and antibiotic disks are written. (Company & country).
8. Choosing antibiotics in this study was based on what reference or protocol? Must be written .
9. In the materials of the methods, the text only refers to the urine specimen. And in the Table 1, refer to a variety of examples!!!!. Should be corrected .
10 . In the discussion, the first sentence should refer to the most important findings of the study. Then the results of this research are compared with other studies, and ultimately the reasons for similarities and differences are written. You must make fundamental reforms in the discussion.
11. Reference should be based on the journal's format. Use more references over the past three years, especially in the discussion section .
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 May 2019

Dear AE,
The content of this manuscript is not consistent with Gene, Cell, and Tissue scope. It is suggested that the author submit it to a medical or clinical journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
The authors Investigated the drug resistance in hospital samples, which is very valuable. But before publishing, some modifying is necessary
1-Manuscript needs grammar correction.
2. The ethics committee's approval is not mentioned in the text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments major revisions must be done and English language editing also is needed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Jun 2019

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewers and AE comments major revisions must be done and English language editing also is needed.
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.

Response to review comments

Note: All changes and corrections are red-written in this file and throughout the revised manuscript file.

EIC comments:

Based on the reviewers and AE comments major revisions must be done and English language editing also is needed.

-We have had an extensive English copy editing by a colleague fluent in English language.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

In general, the article is good and requires more and Newer references.

- We appreciate the positive feedback from this reviewer.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editor

The authors Investigated the drug resistance in hospital samples, which is very valuable. But before publishing, some modifying is necessary

1. manuscript needs grammar correction

-We have had an extensive English copy editing by a colleague fluent in English language.

2.The ethics committee's approval is not mentioned in the text.

- The ethics was mentioned in the text by authors.

Reviewer 3:

1. The title is appropriate.

-Thank you so much.

2. In the abstract, the first sentence should be semantically changed.

- This sentence was changed by authors.

3.In the abstract, in the materials and methods section, the type of samples should be written.

- The type of samples added

4. In abstract, in the results section. The percentage of bacterial resistance to various antibiotics is better to write pvalue.

-Regarding the concern of the reviewer about the p-value, I need to explain that we did not check statistical tests.

5. Keywords should be written based on the mesh system.

- Keywords checked on the mesh categories and added.

6. The volume of the introduction is high, it should be revised.

- Revised by authors.

7.In the materials and methods, the specifications of the culture media and antibiotic disks are written. (Company & country).

- All Company and country names were added by authors.

8. Choosing antibiotics in this study was based on what reference or protocol? Must be written .

- Revised by authors.

9.In the materials of the methods, the text only refers to the urine specimen. And in the Table 1, refer to a variety of examples!!!!. Should be corrected .

- Corrected by authors.

10 . In the discussion, the first sentence should refer to the most important findings of the study. Then the results of this research are compared with other studies, and ultimately the reasons for similarities and differences are written. You must make fundamental reforms in the discussion.

- We described this matter in the discussion.

11. Reference should be based on the journal's format. Use more references over the past three years, especially in the discussion section .

- Corrected by authors.

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) 18 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Changes are well done. In my opinion, it is capable of publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 24 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
In my opinion, the manuscript is not acceptable for publishing in this journal. Poor experimental design: an inadequate sample size (60 strains) of study, the method of study just is a phenotypic method (disk diffusion).
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
The article's amendments are almost done.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments and as I read revisions were done. It can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 Jun 2019

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewers' and AE comments revisions were done. It can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.