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.112486
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(2); e112486

Peer Review Report for "Co-occurrence of Carbapenemase-encoding Genes Among *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Clinical Isolates: Positive Relationship of *bla* $_{NDM}$ and *bla* $_{SIM}$ with Imipenem Resistance"

Author(s): Maryam Galehdar, Maryam Ghane, Laleh Babaeekhou

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 21 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 22 Apr 2021

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) — 5 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Please observe the comments in the attached file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 10 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. The title of the manuscript is not appropriate. It should be written more concisely and better.
2. In the introduction, a description of the advantages of using MLST is not enough
3. MLST results are not sufficient for the three isolates and it is not clear what were the characteristics of these three isolates
4. It would be better MLST was performed for all isolates resistant to imipenem or meropenem, or first tested with simpler typing methods such as ERIC and then with MLST.
5. The range of MIC and MBC standard values for meropenem and imipenem according to

CLSI standards should be defined in section 3.2

6. It is not specified p-value to report the relationship between results

7. Mention the percentage and frequency of resistance together in lines 146 and 147

8. The STs belonged to which clonal complex?

9. In the discussion section, the content is insufficient to interpret and compare MLST results.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 10 Apr 2021

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)** 10 Apr 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.

To: Editor-in-Chief of **Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology**

Dear Professor Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to improve the manuscript entitled "Co-occurrence of carbapenemse-encoding genes among *Klebsiella pneumoniae* clinical isolates*:* positive relationship between *bla* $_{NDM}$ and *bla* $_{SIM}$ with imipenem resistance". Manuscript has been revised according to the reviewer's suggestions. The individual issues raised by the reviewers are listed below together with our actions and comments. All the changes are highlighted in the text.

Reviewer 1

1- The title of the manuscript is not appropriate. It should be written more concisely and better.

Action/comment:

The title was rewritten.

2- In the introduction, a description of the advantages of using MLST is not enough

Action/comment:

The advantages of MLST were added to the text.

3- MLST results are not sufficient for the three isolates and it is not clear what were the characteristics of these three isolates

Action/comment:

These three isolates were selected because they were resistant against both carbapenems and showed high MIC against imipenem and meropenem. This is stated in the text (Section 4.3). In addition the characteristics of the isolates are presented in Table 3.

4- It would be better MLST was performed for all isolates resistant to imipenem or meropenem, or first tested with simpler typing methods such as ERIC and then with MLST.

Action/comment:

MLST is a very costly technique. However, we selected the isolates which were highly resistant to both antibiotics and characterize them by MLST.

5- The range of MIC and MBC standard values for meropenem and imipenem according to CLSI standards should be defined in section 3.2.

Action/comment:

The range of MIC and MBC standard values for meropenem and imipenem according to CLSI standards was defined in section 3.2.

6- It is not specified p-value to report the relationship between results.

Action/comment:

We specified p-value and statistically reported the relationship between two carbapenemase genes and resistance to carbapenems. However we stated that other mechanisms of resistance (deficiency or decreased expression of porins) must also be considered.

7- Mention the percentage and frequency of resistance together in lines 146 and 147

Action/comment:

The percentage and frequency of resistance together were mentioned.

8- The STs belonged to which clonal complex.

Action/comment:

The clonal comples of each ST was mentioned in Table 3.

9- In the discussion section, the content is insufficient to interpret and compare MLST results.

Action/comment:

The discussion was improved and the MLST results were compared with other studies.

Reviewer 2

Please observe comments in attached file

Action/comment:

Editing was done according to the comments provided in the text by the reviewer.

Except:

The reviewer suggested the title change to:

Co-occurrence of *bla* $_{NDM}$ with *bla* $_{SIM}$ in clinical carbapenem resistant *KLebsiella pneumoniae* isolates in Iran

Action/comment:

In the present study we observed Co-occurrence of all carbapenemase genes among *K. pneumoniae* isolates. In addition, we found a relationship between *bla* $_{NDM}$ and *bla* $_{SIM}$ with resistance to Imipenem.

The reviewer suggested:

In figure 1 MBC should change to MIC.

Action/comment:

This figure represents the MBC of imipenem and meropenem against *K. pneumoniae* isolates.

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)** 22 Apr 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 the 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.