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.109982
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(11); e109982

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of *PVL* and *LucED* Genes in Methicillin-Resistant and Susceptible Isolates of *Staphylococcus aureus* Isolated from Burn Patients in Kermanshah, Iran"

Author(s): Feizollah Mansouri, Siavash Vaziri, Mandana Afsharian, Mohammad Hossein Zamanian, Nahid Madadi-Goli, Zainab Mohseni Afshar, Ronak Miladi, Mohsen Bijari, Amirhossain Naghash Zargar, Fatemeh Nouri, Kamal Ahmadi, Mohsen Azizi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 15 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 19 Feb 2021

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) — 2 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should address all of my comments attached in the file of the manuscript.
- The most important default of this study is the detection of MRSA in the wrong method.
- MRSA isolates should determine according to disk diffusion exactly against two antibiotic agents of cefoxitin and oxacillin. Then, those isolates which show complete resistance toward these two antibiotic agents can introduce as MRSA!!!!!
But they only studied the presence of the mecA gene!
Thanks.

Farhad Safarpoor Dehkordi: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 2 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should address all of my comments attached in the file of the manuscript.
- The most important default of this study is the detection of MRSA in the wrong method.

- MRSA isolates should determine according to disk diffusion exactly against two antibiotic agents of cefoxitin and oxacillin. - Then, those isolates which show complete resistance toward these two antibiotic agents, can introduce as MRSA!!!!!
But they only studied the presence of the mecA gene!
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Dec 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. https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/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: 109982). The article was completely revised and the flaws were corrected as much as possible. Corrections were identified in the article file as yellow **highlight**.

Question 1 (WU1): Text is full from grammatical and topographical mistakes which highlighted by the blue color. Please correct all of them Answer: The text of article was revised and corrected grammatically and topographically.
The most important default of this study is the detection of MRSA in wrong method. MRSA isolates should determine according to disk diffusion exactly against two antibiotic agents of cefoxitin and oxacillin. Then, those isolates which show complete resistance toward these two antibiotic agent, can introduce as MRSA!!!!! But you only studied the presence of the mecA gene! Answer: Thanks to the correct opinions and instead of the esteemed judges, in this article we used both oxacillin and cefoxetin antibiotic discs for initial identification and confirmation of MRSA isolates, but unfortunately in the text of the article only oxacillin disc was mentioned and cefoxtein disc was mistyped. The text of the procedure was removed, which was corrected in the revised version of the article.
Question 2 (WU2): Please use from the following reference in your paper Answer:

Thanks to the respected judge, all the valuable references suggested were used in the text of the article .

Question 3 (WU3): This is not ethical code of your research !

Answer:

The ethics code of the study was re-reviewed at the National Committee on Ethics, and its authenticity was confirmed. PDF is the National Ethics Committee was submitted with the article.

Question 4 (WU4): Grammatical

Answer:

The text of the article was revised and corrected grammatically and topographically.

Question 5 (WU5): In which criteria

Answer:

The transfer medium here was BHI medium containing 10% glycerol, which was used to transfer bacterial isolates from the hospital to the medical school laboratory.

Question 6 (WU6): Culture on which media?!

Answer:

The culture medium considered by the esteemed referee in the text of the article (mentioned below) included blood agar and nutrient agar medium:

Isolates in BHI broth (Merck,Germany) were transferred to the laboratory, and after culture in blood agar and nutrient agar (Hi-Media Indian) media ,they were incubated at 37 ° C for 24 hours.

Question 7 (WU7): identified

Answer:

The mentioned item was corrected.

Question 8 (WU8): Grammatical

Answer:
The text of the article was revised and corrected grammatically and topographically.

Question 9 (WU9): Add their concentration. Add the main reference you used Add the main reason for their selection How did the diameter of the growth inhibition zone of bacteria were interpreted? Answer: Concentrations of antibiotic discs were added. Based on the results of the studies, the antibiotics of this study were selected and a reference was added for them. The method of measuring the growth inhibition zone of antibiotics and their interpretation was added.
Question 10 (WU10): Please add the method of the experiment completely Answer: The study method was completed as much as possible.
Question 11 (WU11): Dear Author This is one of the genes that encode resistance toward penicillins and if you want to identified the MRSA strains, it is not sufficient to study the presence of the mecA gene! Answer: Thanks to the correct opinions and instead of the esteemed judges, in this article we used both oxacillin and cefoxetin antibiotic discs for initial identification and confirmation of MRSA isolates, but unfortunately in the text of the article only oxacillin disc was mentioned and cefoxtein disc was mistyped. The text of the procedure was removed, which was corrected in the revised version of the article.
Question 12 (WU12): Please ensure that these strains harbored both genes. Answer: According to the results of other valid studies that used these strains as isolates containing these genes, these standard strains were used.

Question 13 (WU13): As you used boiling method, How the quality and quantity of extracted DNA were examined?

Answer:
To confirm the DNA extracted by boiling method, after DNA extraction of the isolates, its quality and quantity were measured using a NanoDrop, and the results obtained from it were mentioned in the modified version of the article:

Question 14 (WU14): One PCR reaction for both genes?! Is it multiplex? Please add explanation.

Answer:

Thanks to the respected judge , the PCR reaction was carried out separately for each of the genes in the PCR reaction , and their full description was added to the text and table 1 of the article.

Question 15 (WU15): Add the time and voltage and also all ingredients completely+ name of device including PCR, UV?

Answer:

The mentioned items were added to the method of the article.

Question 16 (WU16): Title of the tables should attached out of the table just above it. Correct it in all tables.

Answer:

The titles of the tables were placed above and outside the tables.

Question 17 (WU17): Please add the volume of the PCR reactions and also temperature in the table.

Answer:

PCR reaction conditions for the studied genes were added to the article table.

Question 18 (WU18): Im not sure about the fact that how did you determined the P value and attached it beer as your work contained qualitative data.

Answer:

Thanks to the respected judge, in this study we statistically analyzed quantitative data such as the percentage of drug resistance between MRSA and MSSA isolates and set a P-value for them.

Question 19 (WU19): Btween which data?

Answer:

Here, a statistical analysis was performed between the drug resistance of MRSA isolates and MSSA isolates and P-value was determined for them, which in some cases a significant relationship was observed.

Question 20 (WU20): Wrong statistical analysis

Answer:

Thanks to the respected judge, in this case the frequency of LucED gene was equal to 56 cases, the total frequency of which in isolates S (38), R (17) and I (1) was 56 cases.

Question 21 (WU21): Wrong statistical analysis

Answer:

Thanks to the respected judge , in this case the frequency of LucED gene was equal to 56 cases, the total frequency of which in isolates S (27), R (28) and I (1) was 56 cases.

Question 22 (WU22): As you work is qualitative, How did you determine the significant level! It is mainly wrong

Answer:

Thanks to the opinion of the esteemed judge, in this study, we analyzed quantitative data and their P-value was determined. The results of table.3 showed the frequency of Leukocidin genes in resistant, sensitive and intermediate isolates to the studied antibiotics. Statistical analysis was performed between the frequency of these genes in resistant, intermediate and sensitive isolates, which a significant relationship was observed between the frequency of *luk-*

E/D gene in sensitive, resistant and intermediate isolates to ciprofloxacin and tobramycin.
Question 23 (WU23): Between which data? Answer: Statistical analysis was performed between the frequency of these genes in sensitive, resistant and intermediate isolates. Among these, a significant relationship was observed between the frequency of *luk-E/D* gene in sensitive, resistant and intermediate isolates to ciprofloxacin and tobramycin.
Question 24 (WU24): In the left figure, the size is not match with 296 bp?! It is something about 260 bp in the figure! Answer: Thanks to the esteemed judge, in the left PCR image, the exact size of the *luk-E/D* gene band is 269 bp according to table-1 of the article, but unfortunately in a typo instead of 269 we wrote 296 which this error was fixed in the revised version of the article.
Question 25 (WU25): Where is the PCR figure of the mecA gene?! Answer: The figure of the *mecA* gene was add.

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.

Farhad Safarpoor Dehkordi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 2 Feb 2021

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)** 2 Feb 2021

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 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. https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
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.

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: 109982). The article was completely revised and the flaws were corrected as much as possible. Corrections were identified in the article file as yellow **highlight**.

Reviewers' Comments:

Minor comments to the author:	
1- Some parts of the text need grammatical and topographical checking by a native English speaker.	Answer: The text of article was revised and corrected grammatically and topographically.
2- Please the exact importance of MRSA from a public health view in the background.	Answer: The mentioned item was added.

3- How patients didn't receive any antibiotics for a week? How did you ensure?	Answer: In this study, Sampling was performed from burn wounds of 73 patients who had not consumed any antibiotics according to patient reports and files a week before they were hospitalized.
4- Authors used abbreviations in the article but didn't mention the full name of abbreviations. For example BHI. In the first use of these words, you should add their full names and then their abbreviations. Please considered in all parts of the text.	Answer: The mentioned item was corrected.
6- Hi Media India not Indian.	Answer: The mentioned item was corrected. Website HiMedia Company: http://www.himedialabs.com https://www.himedialabs.com/HML/pages/contact.aspx
7- Please determined the exact differences between MRSA and MSSA isolates obtained from your findings in the conclusion section.	Answer: Differences between MRSA and MSSA isolates in the conclusion section was added.

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 19 Feb 2021

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.