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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Gene, Cell and Tissue
Article DOI: 10.5812/gct.99830
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 7(1); e99830

Peer Review Report for "Poor Antimicrobial Activity of Opium Against Carbapenem-Resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Isolates"

Author(s): Fatemeh Khajooee, Saeed Shoja

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 29 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 7 Jan 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)

8 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- The text is poor in English grammar and writing. The name of the genus and species must be Italic.
- Study design is not described sufficiently.
- Confirmation of the isolates should be done by molecular method. What is the scientific name of the selected opium?
- On what basis the sample size is selected?
- Use graphs as an alternative to tables.
- On what basis dilutions of opium are selected for drug susceptibility testing.
- The method of treatment of drug sensitivity is not clearly explained.
- As a result, the Antimicrobial activity of opium on resistant and sensitive carbapenem isolates should be separately evaluated.
- The results of the study should be more expanded.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Minor revision should be done, it is acceptable if they consider the comments.
Thanks.

Saeedeh Salimi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable for publication after major revision.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 15 Dec 2019

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers' and AE comments this manuscript needs major revision in the Methods and discussion parts. Precise English language editing also must be done.
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

We thank you for your careful reading of the manuscript and helpful comments and suggestions. We have made revisions according to your comments and suggestions, as described below.

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

Reviewer 1:

The text is poor in English grammar and writing. The name of the genus and species must be Italic.

Authors' Response: We have had an extensive English copy editing by a colleague fluent in English language.

Study design is not described sufficiently.

Confirmation of the isolates should be done by molecular method.

Authors' Response: Thank you for your comment and suggestion.

-we described this matter in the methods section as:

"The isolates were identified as *Pseudomonas aeroginosa* using phenotypic microbiology tests (12) and verified by polymerase chain reaction (PCR), using specific primers of gyrB gene for the *P. aeruginosa* (13)."

What is the scientific name of the selected opium?

Authors' Response: We described this matter in the Introduction section as:

"Furthermore, finding a new therapeutic method for treatment of such isolates is necessary. From past, *Papaver somniferum* was considered as an antibacterial agent in traditional medicine. Opium (or poppy tears) is dried latex obtained from the seed capsules of *Papaver somniferum"*

On what basis the sample size is selected?

Authors' Response: Thank you for your comment and suggestion.

-we described this matter in the methods section as:

"These isolates were randomly selected from clinical samples at Shahid Mohammadi and Pediatrics Hospitals affiliated to Hormozgan University of Medical Sciences in Bandar Abbas located in south of Iran. Random numbers were computer generated to select samples using the laboratory submission numbers. The random selection process repeated until the target number was obtained."

Use graphs as an alternative to tables.

Authors' Response: We added graph based on reviewer's recommendation.

On what basis dilutions of opium are selected for drug susceptibility testing.

Authors' Response: Thank you for your comment and suggestion.
-we described this matter in the methods section as:

"According to clinical and laboratory standards institute (CLSI) guidelines (15); various concentrations of opium ranged from 4 µg/ml to 2048 µg/ml were prepared in Mueller-Hinton broth (Merck, Germany) with a disposable 96-well microdilution plate (16)."
The method of treatment of drug sensitivity is not clearly explained.

Authors' Response:

Authors' Response: We added with more explain.

In result, Antimicrobial activity of opium on resistant and sensitive carbapenem isolates should be separately evaluated.

Authors' Response: Thank you for your comment and suggestion.
Response: We have added this information based on reviewer's recommendation.

The results of the study should be more expanded.
Authors' Response: Authors' Response: We added with more explain.

Reviewer 2:
Minor revision ... acceptable if correct the comments.

Authors' Response: We appreciate the positive feedback from this reviewer.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear editor
The manuscript is acceptable for publication after major revision.

EIC Decision:

Based on the reviewers and AE comments this manuscript needs major revision in Methods and discussion parts. Precise English language editing also must be done.
Authors' Response: We appreciate the positive feedback from the reviewer. All suggestions added. We have had an extensive English copy editing by a colleague fluent in English language.

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) — 5 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
All comments posted have been corrected and included in the article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
According to the reviewers, the changes are well done and Printable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments and our own reading of the manuscript, the revisions that the authors made to the manuscript are very effective in addressing the remaining concerns.
I am pleased to inform them that our decision is to accept the manuscript and "gene, cell, and tissue" would like to publish their manuscript entitled "Poor antimicrobial activity of opium on carbapenem-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa isolates "in next issue.
Sincerely yours,

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jan 2020

Dear AUthors,
Rivisions were done well. Thus it can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.