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.114473
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(2); e114473

Peer Review Report for "Molecular Characteristics of Carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Isolates Producing bla_{VIM}, bla_{NDM}, and bla_{IMP} in Clinical Centers in Isfahan, Iran"

Author(s): Houri Alizadeh, Alireza Khodavandi, Fahimeh Alizadeh, Nima Bahador

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Mar 2021
Revised Date: 24 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 26 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) 6 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
In this paper, the authors investigated the clinical strains of K. pneumonia. A collection of 240 strains from different origins were tested for antibiotic susceptibility and next, the antibiotic resistance strains was confirmed using phenotypic and genotypic methods, including ESBL, MBL and virulence factors evaluated. The typing of resistance strains using MLST and Rep-PCR was performed.
Comments for the authors:
1- Although virulence factor genes have been studied in this study, but their role and the relationship among the strains in the text, including the abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusion are not explained.
2- Line 72: There is no connection between the final sentence and the text of this paragraph.
3- Line 108: Which reference is used to interpret the data?
4- Line 118: A plasmid extraction kit is used for genomic DNA extraction. Explain what modified method is used for this process?
5- I suggest to the molecular detection sections (3.5 sections), including MBL and

virulence factors and antibiotic resistance genes, are integrated.
6- Drug resistance genes also include carbapenemase genes, while have been explained in separate sections (in 4.4 and 4.5 sections).
7- Line 202: " In ESBL isolates ": In the previous sections of the text, the method of initial detection of ESBL is not mentioned. Briefly describe the phenotypic method of isolating strains.
8- The tables are not numbered in the order in which they are used in the text. Correct the order of use of tables in the text.
9- The items displayed in the Figure 5 (dendrogram), are not text-independent and do not clearly convey the important results of the article, which requires additional explanations.
10- Table 1 does not follow the usual format in drawing the table and there is no coordination between the column heads for example Annealing, No. of alleles, Reference and Temp.
11- The numbering of the figures should be matched with the main text.
12- The number of tables can be reduced and Table 5 can be summarized in Table 1.
13- In reference No. 6 should be rewritten.
14- In reference No. 42 " antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy ": use the standard abbreviation of the journal name.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 8 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The article is well-edited and in my opinion there is no particular problem for publishing the article.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Apr 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** (0) 14 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.

Dear Editor in Chief

Thank you very much for the thorough review of our paper and the constructive comments which help us improve the manuscript entitled “Molecular characteristics of carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolates producing blaVIM, blaNDM and blaIMP at clinical centers in Isfahan, Iran”. We are pleased to submit for publication the revised version of our manuscript based on the reviewer’s comments. We appreciated the constructive criticisms of the editor in chief and the reviewers. Herein, we explain how we revised the paper based on those comments and recommendations as outlined below. The revised manuscript text marked to show changes using yellow highlighting.

Reviewer #1:

1- Although virulence factor genes have been studied in this study, but their role and the relationship among the strains in the text, including the abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusion are not explained.

Reply: Many thanks for your detailed comment. It is explained in the in all relevant sections.

2- Line 72: There is no connection between the final sentence and the text of this paragraph.

Reply: We sincerely appreciate your valuable comment. The final sentence was removed.

3- Line 108: Which reference is used to interpret the data?

Reply: The guidelines of the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) M100-S27 criteria. Highlighted in the text.

4- Line 118: A plasmid extraction kit is used to genomic DNA extraction. Explain what modified method is used for this process?

Reply: There were no modification, so the modification section was removed.

5- I suggest to the molecular detection sections (3.5 sections), including MBL and virulence factors and antibiotic resistance genes, are integrated.

Reply: The requested item has been modified.

6- Drug resistance genes also include carbapenemase genes, while have been explained in separate sections (in 4.4 and 4.5 sections).

Reply: The requested item has been modified.

7- Line 202: " In ESBL isolates ": In the previous sections of the text, the method of initial detection of ESBL is not mentioned. Briefly describe the phenotypic method of isolating strains.

Reply: It's done as requested.

8- The tables are not numbered in the order in which they are used in the text. Correct the order of use of tables in the text.

Reply: It's done as requested.

9- The items displayed in the Figure 5 (dendrogram), are not text-independent and do not clearly convey the important results of the article, which requires additional explanations.

Reply: The figure was replaced with more details and the relevant descriptions were highlighted in the text.

10- Table 1 does not follow the usual format in drawing the table and there is no coordination between the column heads for example Annealing, No. of alleles, Reference and Temp.

Reply: It's done as requested.

11- The numbering of the figures should be matched with the main text.

Reply: It's done as requested.

12- The number of tables can be reduced and Table 5 can be summarized in Table 1.

Reply: It's done as requested.

13- In reference No. 6 should be rewritten.

Reply: It's done as requested.

14- In reference No. 42 " antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy ": use the standard abbreviation of the journal name.

Reply: It's done as requested.

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)** 26 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.