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.111682
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(12); e111682

# Peer Review Report for "Distribution and Antimicrobial Susceptibility of Gram-Positive and Gram-Negative Pathogens Isolated from Patients Hospitalized in a Tertiary Teaching Hospital in Southwestern China"

**Author(s):** Lingling Xu, Zhangrui Zeng, Yinhuan Ding, Min Song, Kui Yang, Jinbo Liu

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 9 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.

**Zohreh Mashak**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 8 Jan 2021

Dear AE
Comments for the authors:
- Write the statistical analysis in abstract
- Correct:Line34:GNP change to GPB;Line354:infectio to infection;
- Describe others in Fig1
- Use newer references(2019 and 2020) and add reference of CLSI(2013-2018)
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Jan 2021

Dear AE
Thanks for submitting this article to this journal. The authors should consider theses points:
1. What is the basis of CLSI diagnosis?
2. Why are two sources used to detect bacteria? (CLSI and MicroScan WalkAway 96 Plus System)

3. Prepare a list of the non-dominant bacterial population.
4. In the discussion, how to detect bacteria is also compared with molecular methods
5. please explain more:
- Modified broth microdilution tests.
- Detection rate of bacteria.
Thanks.

**Zohreh Mashak**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting the article to this journal. The authors should consider theses points:
1. Add the statistical analysis in the abstract.
2. What is the basis of CLSI diagnosis? Use add reference of CLSI(2013-2018).
3. Prepare a list of the non-dominant bacterial population.
4. In the discussion, how to detect bacteria is also compared with molecular methods
5. Explain more: Modified broth microdilution tests. And also the detection rate of bacteria.
6. Describe others in Fig1
7. Correct:Line34:GNP change to GPB;Line354:infectio to infection;
8. Use newer references(2019 and 2020)
9. What was the reason for choosing the special antibiotics in your research?
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 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 (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.

**Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology**

**Manuscript ID : 111682**

**Title: Distribution and antimicrobial susceptibility of gram-positive and gram-negative pathogens isolated from patients hospitalized in a tertiary teaching hospital in southwestern China .**

**Dear Editor**

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript titled “Distribution and antimicrobial susceptibility of gram-positive and gram-negative pathogens isolated from patients hospitalized in a tertiary teaching hospital in southwestern China”. We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions. We answered the reviewers' questions one by one, and the corrections are marked in red in the revised manuscript. The point-by-point responses to the reviewers' questions are as follows.

**Reviewer 1:**

**Response:** Thanks again for your review of our research.

1. **Write the statistical analysis in abstract.**

**Response：** Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the statistical analysis in abstract section in the revised manuscript.

2. **Correct:Line34:GNP change to GPB;Line354:infectio to infection**

**Response:** Thank you for pointing out the mistake. We have modified these words in the revised manuscript.

3. **Describe others in Fig1.**

**Response：** Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the statistical analysis in abstract

section in the revised manuscript under the Fig 1.

**4.Use newer references(2019 and 2020) and add reference of CLSI(2013-2018).**

**Response：** Thank you for your suggestion. We have add the **references of CLSI(2013-2018)** in the revised manuscript. we have replaced some of the newer references(2019 and 2020) in the revised manuscript.

**Reviewer 2:**

**Response:** Thanks again for your review of our research.

**1.What is the basis of CLSI diagnosis?**

**Response：** Thank you for your suggestion. The basis of CLSI diagnosis is the “Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; CLSI Document M100-(S23-S28)”.We have added references in the revised manuscript.

**2. Why are two sources used to detect bacteria? (CLSI and MicroScan WalkAway 96 Plus System)**

**Response:** Our laboratory compared the two identification methods and found that there was no difference in the identification of bacteria by MicroScan WalkAway 96Plus System and Microflex LT. The bacteria were identified by MicroScan WalkAway 96 Plus System before 2017, and identified by Microflex LT after 2017.The identification of bacteria was confirmed both by MicroScan WalkAway 96 Plus System and Microflex LT MALDI-TOF MS system. So this study included two identification methods.In addition, MRSA and ESBL were screened through the iMicroScan WalkAway 96 Plus System, and then verified by CLSI.

**3.Prepare a list of the non-dominant bacterial population.**

**Response:** Thank you for your valuable comments. Because several hundreds of kinds of bacteria were identified in our hospital from 2013-2018, we only have added the list of the top 50 bacteria in the Supplementary Table S1.

**4. In the discussion, how to detect bacteria is also compared with molecular methods.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. In the discussion, we have not discussed the molecular methods of detecting bacteria, but only discussed the reason why the imipenem and meropenem resistance rate of Pseudomonas aeruginosa was higher than that of ceftazidime and cefepime. Combined with the isolates which were sensitive to cephalosporins but resistant to carbapenem antibiotics in our hospital, the mechanism of resistance was described.

**5. please explain more:**

**- Modified broth microdilution tests.**

**- detection rate of bacteria.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. **Modified broth microdilution tests** came from the manufacturer's recommendations of MIC Panel of the MicroScan System (Siemens, Germany) ; which is a miniaturized broth dilution tests, only dehydrated, and different antibiotics were diluted in MH broth supplemented with calcium and magnesium ions, making its concentration across the range of clinical significance. **Detection rate of bacteria** is the ratio of the culture -positive samples to the total samples and then multiplied by 100%.

**Associate Editor's Comments:**

**Associate Editor 1:**

**Response:** Thanks again for your review of our research.

**1. Add the statistical analysis in abstract .**

**Response** ： Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the statistical analysis in abstract section in the revised manuscript.

**2. What is the basis of CLSI diagnosis? Use add reference of CLSI(2013-2018).**

**Response** ： Thank you for your suggestion. The basis of CLSI diagnosis is the "Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; CLSI Document M100-(S23-S28)".We have

added references in the revised manuscript. We have add the **references of CLSI(2013-2018)** in the revised manuscript.

**3. Prepare a list of the non-dominant bacterial population.**

**Response:** Thank you for your valuable comments. Because several hundreds of kinds of bacteria were identified in our hospital from 2013-2018, we only have added the list of the top 50 bacteria in the Supplementary Table S1.

**4. In the discussion, how to detect bacteria is also compared with molecular methods**.

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. In the discussion, we have not discussed the molecular methods of detecting bacteria, but only discussed the reason why the imipenem and meropenem resistance rate of Pseudomonas aeruginosa was higher than that of ceftazidime and cefepime. Combined with the isolates which were sensitive to cephalosporins but resistant to carbapenem antibiotics in our hospital, the mechanism of resistance was described.

**5. explain more: Modified broth microdilution tests. And also detection rate of bacteria.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. Modified broth microdilution tests came from the manufacturer's recommendations of MIC Panel of the MicroScan System (Siemens, Germany)；which is a miniaturized broth dilution tests, only dehydrated, and different antibiotics were diluted in MH broth supplemented with calcium and magnesium ions, making its concentration across the range of clinical significance. Detection rate of bacteria is the ratio of the culture -positive samples to the total samples and then multiplied by 100%.

**6. Describe others in Fig1**

**Response**： Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the statistical analysis in abstract section in the revised manuscript under the Fig 1.

**7.Correct:Line34:GNP change to GPB;Line354:infectio to infection;**

**Response:** Thank you for pointing out the mistake. We have modified these words in the revised manuscript.

**8.Use newer references(2019 and 2020)**

**Response：** Thank you for your suggestion. we have replaced some of the newer references(2019 and 2020) in the revised manuscript.

**9.What was the reason for choosing the special antibiotics in your research?**

**Response：** At present, the detection rate of multidrug-resistant and pan-drug-resistant bacteria in China is increasing, and these special antibiotics such as tigecycline have become the last drugs used by patients with multidrug-resistant and pan-drug-resistant bacterial infections. It is reported that the resistance rate of tigecycline continues to increase in some areas of China. Therefore, our research aims to better monitor its resistance and provide an epidemiological basis for clinical treatment,and prevent the continued increase of resistance rate.

We hope that our revision meets the requirements presented by the referees for its publication in your journal. Please let me know if anything more is needed.

Thank you for your assistance in reviewing this manuscript.

Best regards,

**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 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.