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.103290
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(8); e103290

Peer Review Report for "Oral Candidiasis in Hematological Malignancy Patients: Identification and Antifungal Susceptibility Patterns of Isolates"

Author(s): Masoud Mardani, Sara Abolghasemi, David Darvishnia, Ensieh Lotfali, Reza Ghasemi, Mohammad Mahdi Rabiei, Azam Fattahi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 14 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Sep 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) — 24 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
This paper reports " Oral Candidiasis in Hematological Malignancies Patients; Identification and Antifungal Susceptibility Patterns among Isolates".
It can be seen that the authors have done useful investigations and most of their parts are valuable. However, it needs minor revisions before its publication. The revision specified in the form of comments in the file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well-written, the experimental approach is also appropriate and suitable to be published.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 9 Sep 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** (0)

10 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
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 the 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 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.

Replies to comments

OPC add here. (line 5)

Action/Comment: The text was edited.

Correct the sentence: oral candidiasis in patients with hematological malignancies. (line 8,9)
Action/Comment: The text was edited.

kindly number be added such as 74 (61.66%). (line 18,19)
Action/Comment: The text was edited.

albicans should be Italic in the all of text. (line 42)
Action/Comment: The text was edited totally.

kindly Correct the sentence. (line 47)
Action/Comment: The text was edited.

Why not did use the Gram stain or Giemsa?(line 59)

Action/Comment:
According study of Novikova et al*, The use of Gram-stained smears did not increase the number of cases positive for candida morphotypes in comparison with that found by studying methylene blue-stained smears. The methylene blue staining can be recommended for the diagnosis of *Candida* infections, as it is simpler to perform (a one-step procedure that takes 60 seconds). Thus, it is time-saving as Compared to Gram or Giemsa staining.

Microscopy of stained smears of vaginal secretion in the diagnosis of recurrent vulvovaginal candidosis. N Novikova, E Yassievich... - (*)
International journal of ..., 2002 - journals.sagepub.com

For diagnose oral candidiasis, How many colonies had to be grown in SC culture medium? (line 62)

Action/Comment:
Because *Candida* species are encountered as normal flora of the mucous membranes, digestive tract, and skin, their
isolation in culture (even a few colonies) must be supported by the direct demonstration of characteristic budding yeast pseudohyphae and hyphae.

The hyphal wall protein-coding gene (HWP1) can be evaluated as a identification and phylogenetic marker in Candida tropicalis, C. orthopsilosis, C. parapsilosis and C. glabrata. Why didn't you use this method ,to identification of NAC? (line 79)
Action/Comment:
The majority of molecular procedures have focused on ITS1-5.8S-ITS2 of rRNA gene for the identification of *Candida* species. Therefore, in this study, the first attempt was to find kinds of *Candida* species with ITS gene.
The nucleotide sequences of HWP1 gene were previously amplified only for *C. albicans, C. dubliniensis* and *C. africana* by Romeo and Criseo (**),But Abastabar et al study (***) revealed HWP can be evaluated as a identification and phylogenetic marker in *Candida tropicalis, C. orthopsilosis, C. parapsilosis* and *C. glabrata.* Unfortunately, after the initial test, we read Abastabar et al 's study and there was no need to repeat the molecular tests.

Romeo O, Criseo G. First molecular method for discriminating between Candida africana, Candida albicans, and Candida dubliniensis (**)
by using HWP1 gene. Diag Microbiol Infect Dis. 2008;62(2):230–3. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

Hyphal wall protein 1 gene: A potential marker for the identification of different Candida species and phylogenetic analysis Abastabar (***)
M

Why Candida parapsilosis? It seems you have not Candida parapsilosis. (line 97)
Action/Comment: According to CLSI guideline, *Candida parapsilosis* (ATCC 22019) was used as a quality control.

Kindly provide expansion. (NHL) (line 198)
Action/Comment: The text was edited.

Kindly provide expansion such as: Itraconazole (ITC). (line 217)
Action/Comment: The text was edited.

Write the same. (FCZ) (line 234)
Action/Comment: The text was edited.

What is your suggestion for increasing resistance to fluconazole? (line 227-230)
Action/Comment:
According to some meta-analyses the use of FCZ as a prophylaxis of invasive fungal infections of cancer patients should be limited to populations which the incidence of invasive candidemia is higher than 7% to 10% for decreasing FCZ exposure and resistance.

The END.

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)** 14 Sep 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 reviewers' 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 point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition, the 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.