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.107520
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(10); e107520

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of High-Throughput Next-Generation Sequencing Applied in the Pathogenic Diagnosis of Bloodstream Infections"

Author(s): Yuan Fang, Tao Wang, Li Jin, Zhi-Tao Li, Jian-Qing Zhang, Yang Yang, Zhong Zeng, Han Fei Huang

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 12 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Nov 2020

Revision (0)

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

Maniya Arshadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 27 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. The article is not innovative, several studies have previously suggested the benefits of NGS method for detecting blood culture pathogens.
2. In line 50(background) what is the criteria of tachycardia? (> 90 per minute or > 20 per minute)?
3. The whole article mentions blood culture and compares it with NGS, but the method of blood culture is not explained.
4. The percentage of samples taken by the hospital ward does not match the values listed in Table 1.
5. In table 1, the detection time should be stated based on the day or hour.
6. Cephalosporin and carbapenem belong to the beta-lactam family of drugs but, in Table 1, beta-lactam, Carbapenem, and cephalosporins are listed separately.
7. Use lower case for all antimicrobials agents.
8. Figures 1 and 2 and table 4 are redundant and should be removed.

9. Table 3 is ambiguous. In this table, it should be mentioned that the positive cases of NGS are from 63 samples and the positive cases of blood culture are from 339 samples.
10. In Table 5, seven strains of Staphylococcus epidermidis were isolated using the NGS method, but none of the strains were isolated by blood culture. While among gram-positive bacteria, S. epidermidis is easily isolated by blood culture method. Moreover in this table pseudomonas aeruginosa is listed twice. What justification can be given for isolating more Klebsiella by blood culture than by sequencing? It was better to compare 63 blood culture results and 63 NGS method results in this table.
11. In the results section, line 129, the title (Comparison of Detection Times between BC and NGS) does not match the content of the text.
12. There are a number of grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. Please double-check English grammar and spelling with the assistance of an expert.
13. Correct the name of the first author in references 4, 8, and 13.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
A major revision is recommended for present manuscript, because this manuscript requires modification and changes in the text, improvement, and further justification of presentation. The manuscript most likely requires second review.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Oct 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 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.

Dear reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments on our manuscript entitled " *Evaluation of High-throughput Next-generation Sequencing Applied in the Pathogenic Diagnosis of Bloodstream Infections*" (ID: 107520). Those comments are very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to others research. We have studied the comments carefully and made corrections which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections are in the manuscript and the responds to the reviewers' comments are as follows (the replies are highlighted in red).

Replies to the reviewers' comments:

1、Although previous studies have shown that NGS can be used to detect pathogenic microorganisms, relevant literature is still scarce for clinical purposes, and this research may also help the promotion of clinical NGS.

2、I have corrected the comments you pointed out 2-13.

3、Regarding point 10，it may be that there were more detection times of blood cultures than NGS, and more samples were sent for inspection. Due to the limitation of scientific research funding, we could only submit NGS for each patient once, but clinical blood culture was relatively cheaper.

Once again, thank you very much for your constructive comments and suggestions which would help us both in English and in depth to improve the quality of the paper

Kind regards.

HanFei Huang
E-mail: kmhhf@126.com

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)** 19 Nov 2020

Dear Authors
According to the associated editor report, your manuscript is accepted for publishing in JJM and send 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. For more details:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.