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

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.100348
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(7); e100348

Peer Review Report for "Frequency of *qnr* and *aac(6')Ib-cr* Genes Among ESBL-Producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Strains Isolated from Burn Patients in Kermanshah, Iran"

Author(s): Siavash Vaziri, Mandana Afsharian, Feizollah Mansouri, Mohsen Azizi, Fatemeh Nouri, Nahid Madadi-Goli, Zainab Mohseni Afshar, Mohammad Hossein Zamanian, Amirhooshang Alvandi, Kamal Ahmadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 9 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 31 Aug 2020

Revision (0)

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

Farhad Safarpoor Dehkordi: Reviewer | Revision (0)

13 May 2020

Dear AE,
Manuscript Full Title: The Frequency of qnr and aac(6')Ib-cr Genes Among ESBL-producing Klebsiella Pneumoniae Strains Isolated From Burn Wounds in Kermanshah, Iran
Well, this is an original research work about the Frequency of qnr and aac(6')Ib-cr Genes Among ESBL-producing Klebsiella Pneumoniae Strains Isolated From Burn Wounds in Kermanshah, Iran. Findings of this paper revealed that From 126 K. pneumonia isolates, 52 (41.3%) were identified as ESBL-producing strains. In this regard, ESBL-producing isolates showed higher resistance against antibiotics compared to non-ESBL-producing ones. According to the obtained results, the relevance of PMQR and resistance to ciprofloxacin were determined at 80.76% and 59.6%, respectively. based on the results, aac(6')-Ib-cr (n=70, 55.6%) followed by qnrB (n=44, 34.9%)were the most frequent genes.
However, this is an interesting work, but authors should address the following comments before its fully acceptance.
1- Text is full of grammatical and typographical mistakes. Please use a native English

speaker person which is an expert in microbiology to revise your text.
2- How 126 K. pneumonia strains were isolated?
3- Please add the full history of patients.
4- Please add the incidence of bacteria according to sex, age, and even type of burn wounds of patients. This is because the data of this study are low and authors should increase the scientific base of their article using more data.
5- Add reference for bacterial identification.
6- Add reference for disk diffusion.
7- Add reference for ESBL confirmation.
8- As authors used from the boiling method for DNA extraction (The genomic DNA was extracted from the bacterial culture using the boiling method as previously described [24].), They should add the following information:
How the quality and quantity of DNA were measured?
How the purity of extracted DNA was measured?
9- Add more details for statistical analysis in the method section.
10- Some parts of the text need additional gaps and some parts of the text need additional space between letters and words of the text.
11- What was the main reason for the selection of these kinds of antibiotic agents?
12- What was the main reference for the Antimicrobial susceptibility testing? Please check the CLSI another time. I think that some of the used disks have been deleted from the CLSI guidelines.
13- Authors used only the same control organism, K. pneumonia ATCC 700603, in the disk diffusion. They should use another unsimilar organism, too. For example Pseudomonas or Acinetobacter or …
14- Please add the exact names of positive and negative controls.
15- Which concentration of bacteria was used for antibiotic susceptibility testing.
16- (Figure …) and (Table …) should change to (figure …) and (table …). Make it throughout the text.
17- Please add the results of the multi-drug resistant strains into a separate table.
18- The discussion section has some defects. Please complete the introduction part using the explanation about the characters of the topic. Additionally, add some explanation about the fact that why other surveys cannot solve the issue caused that you and your colleague performed this research. Additionally, the novelty of work and also application of the results obtained from this work. Some of your references were old. You should replace them with some novel references. Are there any survey conducted on this field in Iran and some neighboring countries?
19- Please complete the conclusion with some more relevant information about the exact finding of your survey and also their applications.
20- What are the main applications of your research in the field of microbiology based on the clinical view.
21- Please also unique the style of references throughout the references lists.
22- Please add the ethical considerations.
Cheers
FSD

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Jul 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) 4 Jul 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below (Pleases find attached files). The reviewers recommend the reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. Please answer point by point to reviewer's comments on a separate sheet under WORD format and write your modifications in the revised version (WORD format) in colored or highlighted letters. Your answers to reviewers' queries are not only for the Editorial Board but for the readers and should be included, when appropriate, in the manuscript for improvement and a better understanding.
When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made a point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition, JJM INSTRUCTION attached to the mail, Pleases find it.
Note:
Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Pleases follow the below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
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.

Editor-in-Chief of Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Dear Prof. Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi

Greetings and Regards

Thank you very much for your valuable comments and suggestions on our manuscript (Manuscript ID:100348). The article was completely revised and the flaws were corrected as much as possible. Corrections were identified in the article file as yellow highlight.

	Reviewer 1:	
No.	**Comments:**	**Answers:**
1	Text is full from grammatical and topographical mistakes. Please use from a native English speaker person which is expert in microbiology to revise your text.	According to the respected judge, full-text article was reviewed and corrected in terms of grammar and topography.
2	How 126 K. pneumonia s trains were isolated?	In this descriptive cross-sectional study, 465 clinical samples were collected from burn patients referring to the Imam Khomeini Hospital, Kermanshah, Iran with no history of taking antibiotics more than a week were evaluated during an 11-month period from August 2017 to September 2018. Following collection, the

		samples were transported to the laboratory, cultured on EMB agar and Mac Conkey agar (Merck, Germany), and then incubated for 24 hours at 37°C. In total, 126 *K. pneumonia* isolates were identified applying biochemical tests through culturing in TSI, SIM, MRVP, citrate, and urea broths (Himedia Co., India).
3	Please add the full history of patients.	Unfortunately , in this study we did not have access to the patient's files, that is one of the limitation of the article.
4	Please add the incidence of bacteria according to sex, age and even type of burn wounds of patients. This is because of the data of this study are low and authors should increase the scientific base of their article using more data.	The frequency of bacterial isolates in the age groups of patients was added to the text of the article, but due to the lack of access to other patients' results, including the type of wound, unfortunately we could not add to the text of the article. The rate of 126 *K. pneumonia* isolates among men and women (mean age: 36.11±48.42 years, in the (57.9%) and 53 (42.1%), respectively. The highest and

		lowest frequency of isolates identified of this bacterium in the age groups of 31 to 45 years and under 6 years were 44 people (34.9%) and 6 people (4.8%), respectively.
5	Add reference for bacterial identification.	Reference was added to identify bacteria.
6	Add reference for disk diffusion.	The reference was added for the disc diffusion.
7	Add reference for ESBL confirmation.	Reference was added to confirm the identification of isolates with ESBL.
8	As authors used from the boiling method for DNA extraction (The genomic DNA was extracted from the bacterial culture using the boiling method as previously described, They should add the following information: How the quality and quantity of DNA were measured? How the purity of extracted DNA was measured?	The concentration of the DNA samples was determined at wavelength 260 nm using a NanoDrop Synergy HTX (Bio Tek Instrument, Inc Highland Park, USA) equal to 35 pmol/ul Also, the purity of the extracted DNA at 260/280 nm was 1.85.
9	Add more details for statistical analysis in method section.	Data related to statistical analysis of data were added.
10	Some parts of the text need additional gaps and some parts of the text need additional space between letters	The requested items were modified.

	and words of the text.	
11	What was the main reason for selection of these kinds of antibiotic agents?	The main reason for choosing these antibiotics was based on the results of other validity studies conducted inside and outside the country.
12	What was the main reference for the Antimicrobial susceptibility testing? Please checked the CLSI another time. I think that some of the used disk have been deleted from the CLSI guidelines.	With regards to the correct opinion , we used the 2014 version of CLSI to check the drug sensitivity of the isolates because we did not have access to the new version. In this study, all antibiotics were used.
13	Authors used only a same control organism, K. pneumonia ATCC 700603, in the disk diffusion. They should use another unsimilar organism, too. For example Pseudomonas or Acinetobacter or …	Thanks to the referee, in this study, E.coli standard ATCC 25922 was used together with K. pneumonia ATCC 700603 for quality control of disk diffusion test, which was not mentioned in the text of the article, but this was modified in the article.
14	Please add the exact names of positive and negative controls.	The full names of positive and negative control isolates were added.
15	Which concentration of bacteria was used for antibiotic	The concentration of the

	susceptibility testing.	bacteria was also utilized for antimicrobial susceptibility testing that needed to match the density of the 0.5 McFarland standards (1.5×10^8).
16	(Figure …) and (Table …) should change to (figure …) and (table …). Make it throughout the text.	The requested items were corrected in the text of the article.
17	Please add the results of the multi-drug resistant strains into a separate table.	Due to the limited number of tables , the results of MDR isolates were added to the text of the article.
18	Discussion section has some defects. Please complete the introduction part using the explanation about the characters of the topic. Additionally, add some explanation about the fact that why other surveys cannot solve the issue which caused that you and your colleague performed this research. Additionally, the novelty of work and also application of the results obtained from this work. Some of your references were old. You should replace them with some novel references. Are there any survey conducted on this field in Iran and some neighbor countries?	Thanks to the right and correct opinions, an introduction to the study article was added to the discussion. Due to the importance and necessity of epidemiological studies and also no comprehensive study has been conducted to determine the frequency of PMQR genes in Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates in Kermanshah. This study was designed and conducted for the first time in this region. Older references have been replaced as much as possible with newer references.

		Similar studies inside and outside the country were used to further evaluate the results of the study.
19	Please complete the conclusion with some more relevant information about the exact finding of your survey and also their applications.	Conclusion the article was as complete as possible.
20	What are the main applications of your research in the field of microbiology based on the clinical view.	One of the main uses of the results of this study from a clinical point of view was to provide accurate statistics of drug resistance patterns against different classes of antibiotics, especially quinolones, which can provide valuable information about the proper use of common antibiotics and to prevent the increase of drug resistance to medical personnel.
21	Please also unique the style of references throughout the references lists.	Article references were modified based on the journal format.
22	Please add the ethical considerations.	Ethical considerations was added to the article.

Reviewer 2:		
No.	**Comments:**	**Answers:**

1	Add the subtitle of Tables 2 and 3.	Subtitles for tables 2 and 3 were added.
2	Made the name of bacteria in Italic (Klebsiella pneumoniae).	The name of the bacteria became italic throughout the article.
3	Add the DNA concentration.	The concentration of the DNA samples was determined at wavelength 260 nm using a NanoDrop Synergy HTX (Bio Tek Instrument, Inc Highland Park, USA) equal to 35 pmol/ul Also, the purity of the extracted DNA at 260/280 nm was 1.85.
4	Please revise the grammatical mistakes of the text.	According to the respected judge, full-text article was reviewed and corrected in terms of grammar.
5	Please consider the rules which should use for using abbreviations.	Abbreviated words were initially written in full, then in the following parts they were written as abbreviations.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 31 Aug 2020

Dear Authors
According to the associated editor report, your manuscript is accepted for publishing in JJM and sent to the publisher for the next process.
Note:
Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf.
Thanks.