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

Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcmb.116319
Published in: Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology: 12(3); e116319

Peer Review Report for "Biofilm Formation Capability of Clinical *Helicobacter pylori* Isolates on MKN-45 Cells"

Author(s): Bahareh Attaran, Tahereh Falsafi, Mahboubeh Kabiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 May 2021
Revised Date: 22 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 23 Jun 2021

Revision (0)

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

Morteza Saki: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 23 May 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled: "Biofilm formation capability of Clinical Helicobacter pylori isolates on MKN-45 cells" is well written. The methods and analyses are sound enough and appropriate.
However, there are some errors that need to be corrected. I mentioned all corrections in the uploaded file that can be read by authors. They should correct the errors accordingly. Also, correct the references style of the manuscript based on the journal guidelines.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 25 May 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
the manuscript is interesting but needs revision by the authors before publication
1. please determine how the bacteria defined as weak or strong biofilm producers?
2. please explain the percentage of different type of biofim producers
3. how do you find the matrix in biofilm producers h.pylori?
4. what is the novelty? that already it was confirmed the h.pylori biofilm forming able to

attached on human gastric mucosa epithelium.
5. the discussion need to be revised.6. please remove all strain and just write isolate.
please add the primers for h.pylori identification and the results of PCR.
6. which biochemical tests were applied?
7. alll bacterial name should be italic.
Thanks.

Niloofar Neisi: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 26 May 2021

Dear EIC,
The comments made by reviewers on the following manuscript"Biofilm formation capability of Clinical Helicobacter pylori isolates on MKN-45 cells" represented a need for revision. Among them novelty is the concern of this manuscript has to define in revised manuscript.
Thanks.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision (0)** 26 May 2021

Dear Authors,
Thank you for considering JJCMB for publishing your manuscript. I realized that your manuscript is worth publishing in JJCMB. However, Reviewers of JJCMB raised minor and major comments on your manuscript that have to address/revise/correct in the revision. To avoid extra revision, please revise your manuscript painstakingly and point-to-point in accordance with forwarded comments. Mentioning Ethical approval, ORCID of authors and Funding/grant resources are mandatory. To write an Author contribution, Please follow the style of Journal by visiting INSTRUCTION FOR AUTHORS on the homepage.
Yours Sincerely
EIC, Dr. Mard

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.

Professor Seyyed Ali Mard
Editor-in-Chief
Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology

Dear Professor Seyyed Ali Mard ***June 12, 2021***

We sincerely thank the reviewers for their constructive criticisms and valuable comments. Below please kindly find our point by point reply to comments and the incorporated revisions. We sincerely hope that our responses and the revised version meet your satisfaction and qualify our manuscript for publication in your prestigious journal.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely
Dr. Bahareh Attaran
Corresponding author
Assistant professor in Microbiology
Alzahra University

Reviewer 1:

the manuscript is interesting but need revision before publication.

Comment-1

1. please determine how the bacteria defined as weak or strong biofilm producers?

Response to Comment-1

The following criteria were used for biofilm classification in *H. pylori* clinical isolates:

$OD \leq OD_{control}$ = Non-biofilm-former, $OD_{control} < OD \leq 2 \times OD_{control}$ = Weak biofilm-former, $2 \times OD_{control} < OD \leq 4 \times OD_{control}$ = Moderate biofilm former , $OD > 4 \times OD_{control}$ = Strong biofilm-former.

Comment-2

2. please explain the percentage of different type of biofilm producers

Response to Comment-2

According to our result, 3.3% of isolates are strong biofilm former, 10% were weak biofilm former, and the rest were moderate biofilm former.

Comment-3

how do you find the matrix in biofilm producers h.pylori?

Response to Comment-3

Biofilm matrix observation is not visible with conventional staining methods. In electron microscopy images, the matrix will be lost mainly during sample preparation and fixation. Remains of extracellular exopolysaccharide can be seen on electron microscope images. Our previous study examined the percentage of extracellular protein and carbohydrates in EPS of *Helicobacter pylori* biofilm.

Comment-4

4. what is the novelty? that already it was confirmed the h.pylori biofilm forming able to attached on human gastric mucosa epithelium.

Response to Comment-4

The novelty of this paper is the introduction of a cell line model to study the Helicobacter pylori biofilm formation. This study showed that this cell line, because of mucin secretion, is a suitable model for the study of *H. pylori* biofilm formation in humans.

This model can be used for studies such as studying the effect of biofilm inhibitor drugs or the study of antibiotic resistance in biofilms.

Comment-5

5. the discussion need to be revised.

Response to Comment-5

It was revised.

Comment-6

please remove all strain and just write isolate.

Response to Comment-6

The mentioned error was corrected.

Comment-7

please add the primers for h.pylori identification and the results of PCR.

Response to Comment-7

The isolate were identified by Gram staining, biochemical tests, including catalase, oxidase, urease, nitrate. As previously described, the molecular identity of H pylori strains was confirmed by PCR amplification of gene16sRNA and glm gene (glm-F5' GATAAGCTTTTAGGGGTGTTAGGGG 3', glm-R5' GCATTCACAAACTTATCCCCAATC 3', 16s rRNA-F 'GAAGATAATGACGGTATCTAAC 3',16s rRNA-R5' ATTTCACACCTGACTGACTAT 3')(15, 16).

Comment-8

which biochemical tests were applied?

Response to Comment-8

The isolate were identified by Gram staining, biochemical tests, including catalase, oxidase, urease, nitrate.

Comment-9

All bacterial names should be italic.

Response to Comment-9

The mentioned error was corrected.

#Reviewer 2:

Comment-1

The manuscript entitled: "Biofilm formation capability of Clinical *Helicobacter pylori* isolates on MKN-45 cells" is well written. The methods and analyses are sound enough and appropriate.

However, there are some errors that need to be corrected. I mentioned all correction in the uploaded file that can be read by authors. Correct the errors accordingly. Also, correct the references style of the manuscript based on the journal guidelines.

Response to Comment-1

We are most grateful for the respected reviewer’s thorough attention to detail, which has greatly improved the text.

The mentioned error was corrected.

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.

Morteza Saki: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
The authors have made all the necessary changes in their manuscript. There are some minor comments:
Materials and methods
- line 64: correct the "The isolate was identified by Gram staining, biochemical tests, including catalase, oxidase, urease, nitrate" to "The isolate was identified by Gram staining, biochemical tests, including catalase, oxidase, urease, and nitrate."
- Line 66: Write "16sRNA and glm" in italic style.
Thanks.

Niloofar Neisi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
A minor revision is needed.
Thanks.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
Thank you for considering JJCMB for publishing your valuable manuscript. In accordance with forwarded comments by final reviewer, your manuscript is now accepted for publishing in JJCMB. However, final reviewer made minor comments have to revise.
Mentioning ORCID of authors and "the Ethical approval" is mandatory in this journal. This journal expects to receive the revised paper within 3 days.
Yours Sincerely
EIC, Mard

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.

Professor Seyyed Ali Mard
Editor-in-Chief
Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology

Dear Professor Seyyed Ali Mard ***June 21, 2021***

We sincerely thank the reviewers for their constructive criticisms and valuable comments. We sincerely hope that our revised version meet your satisfaction and qualify our manuscript for publication in your prestigious journal.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely
Corresponding author
Assistant professor in Microbiology
Alzahra University

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.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (2) 21 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
Would you please add "the Ethical approval" of your study. As I mentioned earlier, it is mandatory for publishing in JJCMB.
Best Regards
EIC, Dr. Mard

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.

Professor Seyyed Ali Mard
Editor-in-Chief
Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology

Dear Professor Seyyed Ali Mard ***June 21, 2021***

We sincerely thank the reviewers for their constructive criticisms and valuable comments. We sincerely hope that our revised version meet your satisfaction and qualify our manuscript for publication in your prestigious journal.
I can add Dr. Kabiri orcid iD in journal site. So please kindly add “0000-0003-3123-1365” orcid iD for Dr. mahboubeh kabiri.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely
Dr. Bahareh Attaran
Corresponding author
Assistant professor in Microbiology
Alzahra University

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.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (3) 23 Jun 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.