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

International Journal of Infection
Article DOI: 10.5812/iji.99649
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 7(1); e99649

Peer Review Report for "Infection Risks and Antimicrobial Resistance in Tertiary Hospitals in Benin: Study Cases of Sakété-Ifangni and Menontin Hospitals"

Author(s): Victorien Tamègnon Dougnon, Hornel Koudokpon, Yossounon Chabi, Kafayath Fabiyi, Boris Legba , Jacques Dougnon, Lamine Baba-Moussa

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 17 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 29 Feb 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 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The authors present interesting data about antimicrobial resistance in tertiary hospitals in Benin. This is an important topic and one which appears to be somewhat conflicting in the literature. As is mentioned in most of the references, the agar dilution and broth dilution methods have been standardized by the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. The Etest is also a MIC-based method that has been widely used, as well. All of these methods are much more accurate and reliable than the disk diffusion method which is used for the susceptibility testing in this study. The disk diffusion test is currently widely used since it is easy to perform in clinical microbiology laboratories but as I mentioned not as reliable as other methods.
- Anyhow, to make the article more suitable for publication, the authors need to add more studies and references showing antimicrobial-resistant bacteria in other health settings as well as their own area into both the introduction and discussion. In the methods, please mention how the specimens were kept and sent to the laboratory after swabbing. For the culture of gram-negative bacteria, how did you differentiate between proteus, Klebsiella and

….?

- In the results, there are too many graphs and tables that must be deleted. Just adding the data into the results without drawing some of the graphs is enough. For example, it would be better to write the data from Figures 1, 4, and 6 and table 1 into the results and just draw a table for Figures 2 and 3. For Tables 2 and 3 both the numbers and percentages should be included. The article needs to be revised again.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Jan 2020

Dear AE,

The manuscript contains useful data and could be of interest for journal readers. But i suggest some major revisito on the manuscript.

1- The result section is not well presented. Please, improve it.

2- Based on CLSI procedure, the use of colistin disk in the anti-biogram is not appropriate. You should determine minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for colistin.

3- Table 2, corrects spelling errors.

4- Add the limitations of the study and recommendation for future work at the end of discussion.

5 - Cite reference(s) for methods such as antibiogram and used antibiotics for Cocci and Bacilli bacteria.

Thanks.

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 8 Jan 2020

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Jan 2020

Dear Author,

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

Comments	Page
1- References of Benin in introduction and discussion	Page 3 and 13, 14, 15.
2- How the specimens were kept and send to the laboratory?	Page 3 and 4
3- For culture of gram negative bacteria, how did you differentiate between proteus, klebsiella and others?	Page 4
4- Figure 1, 4 and 6 and table 1 must be deleted	Page 5, 6, 8, 9 and 12
5- Figure 2 and 3; table 2 and 3	Page 7 and 9.
6- Improve the presentation of results	Done. From 6 at 13 page
7- Colistin Disk	Done. Page 7 and 10
8- Table 2, corrects spelling errors	Done. Page 10
9- Limitation of study	Done. Page 15
10- References in method	Done Page 4 and 5

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) 21 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for the revision. The article is suitable for publication after another edition.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 21 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Add caption for table.2
2- The authors have not mentioned to PT and P resistance in Table.2
3- The resistance to OX and P is strange???
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Jan 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Question	Answers
Add caption to table 2	It has been done. Page 7
The authors have not mentioned to PT and P resistance in Table.2	It has been done. Page 7
The resistance to OX and P is strange???	You are right. The OX resistance is the same than P since they are all from the same family.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 7 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Based on my last review, the data is not correct. Resistance to penicillin and oxacillin for S.pyogenes is so rare, while in this paper resistance rate has been reported 100%. This result is strange???
Moreover, the paper was not carefully written. For example:
table 1 does not mention the abbreviation for antibiotics.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 13 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The current manuscript is about “Infectious risk and antimicrobial resistance in tertiary hospitals in Benin: Study cases of Sakété-Ifangni and Menontin hospitals.” which evaluated the antimicrobial resistance and infectious risks in tertiary hospitals in Benin. They claimed that surveillance of infectious risk and antimicrobial resistance is important to prevent healthcare-associated infections.
The english language of the manuscript is sufficient. It was also well written and discussed. In addition, the authors have carried out reforms.
Best regards.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 Feb 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

We have re-checked the strains of S.pyogenes and on 6 strains, we corrected the results. Also we add the captions to the table 1. We also reviewed the manuscript.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 23 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The current manuscript is about “Infectious risk and antimicrobial resistance in tertiary hospitals in Benin: Study cases of Sakété-Ifangni and Menontin hospitals.” which evaluated the antimicrobial resistance and infectious risks in tertiary hospitals in Benin. The authors have carried out reforms.
Best regards.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 28 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
This paper has the potential to be accepted, but one important point has to be clarified.
Please refer to other publications for resistance to Amoxicillin for S.pyogenes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 29 Feb 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 29 Feb 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.