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.115902
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(4); e115902

Peer Review Report for "*In Vitro* Antifungal Activity of Luliconazole, Efinaconazole, and Nine Comparators Against *Aspergillus* and *Candida* Strains Isolated from Otomycosis"

Author(s): Gholamreza Shokoohi, Reza Rouhi Sefidmazgi, Mohammad Etehadnezhad, Bahram Ahmadi, Javad Javidnia, Sadegh Nouripour-Sisakht, Farhang Hooshmand, Ali Rezaei-Matehkolaei, Seyede Nadia Tabatabaeifar, Saham Ansari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 May 2021
Revised Date: 30 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 5 Jul 2021

Revision (0)

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

Maral Gharaghani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 8 May 2021

Dear AE,
This study has good data but needs to be modified.
Thanks.

Saeid Mahdavi Omran: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 18 May 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- In the background section, due to the isolation of Candida auris in Iran, its sources should be included.
- In the method, please specify: these samples were taken from whom? (Sex, age, middle or outer?..).
- Please write the exact specification of the plates.
- Line 87 the date of the incubation period is not known.

- The sequence results are written.
- Lines 115-111 are part of the introduction.
- The discussion is very long and it is should be to remove unnecessary items.
- According to more than 40% of the references are more than 10 years old, please insert the new owns.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 5 Jun 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)** 5 Jun 2021

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 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 is 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 Prof. Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi

Thank you and the anonymous reviewers for the meticulous and rapid reviewing of our manuscript (Manuscript ID:115902). We revised the manuscript considering all suggestions of the reviewers, and it .seems that the paper is well improved, hopefully acceptable by the journal

Responses to reviewers are as followed:

Reviewer 1

1) In line 72: RPMI is not buffered with MOPS, but pH is adjusted with NaOH 4%.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (Line 76-77)

2) Line 73: Samples are not correct, " Drug serial dilutions " is better for use.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (Line 77)

Why the MIC value for *Aspergillus* species was not compared to breakpoint and ECV? ' (3 Epidemiological Cutoff Values for Antifungal Susceptibility Testing. 2nd ed. CLSI supplement M59. 'Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, CLSI M59 for ECV was added to the manuscript. (Line 102-105)

4) Introduce the definition of sensitive and resistance for *Candida* species isolates based on the new version of CLSI-S4. " Reference method for broth dilution antifungal susceptibility testing of yeasts; CLSI standard M27. 4th ed. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute"

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, criteria for susceptible, SDD and resistance based on the new version of CLSI-S4. " Reference method for broth dilution antifungal susceptibility testing of yeasts; CLSI standard M27. 4th ed. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute" was added to the manuscript (lines 100-101).

We used the recently revised CLSI clinical breakpoint (CBP) values. For *C. albicans* strains, caspofungin MIC values of ≤0.25 µg/ml, ≥1 µg/ml , and 0.5 µg/ml were categorized as susceptible,

resistant , and susceptible–dose-dependent, respectively , and fluconazole MIC results of ≤2µg/ml, ≥8 µg/ml and 4 µg/ml were defined as susceptible, resistant and susceptibl-dose-dependent, respectively and CLSI susceptible and resistant breakpoints for VRC and ITC were ≤0.12 , and ≥1 µg/ml, respectively. For *C. glabrata* strains caspofungin MIC values of ≤0.12 µg/ml, ≥0.5 µg/ml and 0.25 µg/ml were categorized as susceptible, resistant and susceptible-dose-dependent, respectively, and fluconazole MIC results of ≥64 µg/ml and ≤32 µg/ml were defined as resistant and susceptible-dose-dependent, respectively, and CLSI susceptible and resistant breakpoints for VRC and ITC were not established. CBPs are not established for AMB in the CLSI M27-S4. Isolates with MIC≥2 µg/ml for AMB were considered resistant.

Line 117 and 118: You wrote "EFN, a novel imidazole, and LUL, a novel triazole", whereas, (5 .luliconazole is imidazole and efinaconazole is triazole drug

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (lines 125).

6) Please cite the reference of this sentence in line 121-123 " The literature is indicative of the potent activities of these antifungals against dermatophytes, *C. albicans*, dematiaceous fungi, *Malassezia*, and azole-resistant and azole-susceptible.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (lines 130).

This manuscript is full of grammatical error and should be corrected by native editor. Such as: This (7 sentence is not correct: Based on a number of studies, this drug has 140 potent activities against *Aspergillus* species(23). If you used number of studies a is not correct and you should cite the many ..……refrences but if you means one study the word studies is not correct. Also, line 150

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, English editing was done.

8) In line 185-187: You wrote: Niwano et al. (36) and Koga et 186 al. (37) were the first researchers reporting a very low MIC (MIC range: 0.031-0.13 and 187 0.031-0.25 mg/mL, respectively) against *C.albicans*. Which one of the antifungals?

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (lines 185).

Reviewer 2

1- In background section, due to the isolation of *Candida auris* in Iran, its sources should be included.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected.

2- In the method, please specify: these samples were taken from whom? (Sex, age, middle or outer?..).

Reply: Demographic data, along with a number of other information, has been submitted as a separate article. Demographic results in our study have no significant relationship with the antifungal susceptibility results.

3- Please write the exact specification of the plates.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, It was corrected accordingly (lines 92-95).

4-Line 87 the date of incubation period is not known.

Reply: Based on CLSI guidelines (CLSI M27-A3 and M27-S4 documents) *Candida* species grow at 35 °C and, therefore Microdilution plates were incubated at 35°C for 24h (If no growth was observed or growth was inadequate, incubation was extended to 48 h) and read visually. For *Aspergillus* species plates were incubated at 35° in 24-72h. It was corrected accordingly (lines 92-95).

5- The sequence results are written.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, It was corrected accordingly (lines 68-69).

6-Lines 111-115 are part of the introduction.

Reply: : According to the reviewer comment, we omitted sentence in Lines 111-115.

7- The discussion is very long and it is should be to remove unnecessary items.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected and summarized.

8- According to more than 40% of the references are more than 10 years old, please insert the new owns.

Reply: the references were been updated.

Associate Editor's Comments

Abstract

1) Add more data about *Aspergillus*, *Candida*, and more... for background subheading

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (lines 4-6)

2) Put italic for in vitro, *Candida* and *Aspergillus*.

Reply: It was corrected. (lines 8-9)

Materials and methods

3-Add more details about DNA extraction, used primers, and ... for RFLP PCR and DNA sequencing of the ITS rDNA and β-tubulin regions.

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (lines 59-69)

4- Add more details about; 1) Total number of samples. 2) demographic details. 3) Duration sampling. 4) sampling year. 5) which hospital. 6) isolation methods and conditions.

Reply: Thank for According to the respected reviewer comment. This research just an antifungal susceptibility testing study and the epidemiologic characteristic of this study contain (Total number of samples, demographic details, duration sampling, sampling year, which hospital, And isolation methods and conditions) was arranged and has been submitted as a separate article.

In Vitro Antifungal Test

add more details about culture conditions for both yeasts and molds fungi, preparing (1 .... suspensions and

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (lines 85-88)

2) Microplate incubation time for yeasts? incubation time for molds?

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, it was corrected. (lines 92-95)

Results

?Add all demographical data, gender, age, otomycosis frequency (yeasts and molds)

.Add the Accession numbers

Reply: According to the respected reviewer comment, Accession numbers was added. (lines 68-69)

Demographic data, along with a number of other information, has been submitted as a separate article. Demographic results in our study have no significant relationship with the antifungal susceptibility results.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 5 Jul 2021

Dear EIC
The manuscript is completely revised according to reviewer comments by authors and it is acceptable for publishing.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Jul 2021

Dear Authors,
I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology and sent to the publisher for the next process. Please remember to always include your manuscript number, whenever inquiring about your manuscript. When you receive the proofs for your article, please check all names and affiliations very carefully, as these cannot be corrected once the article is published. Moreover, Please add the ORCID number to you and your collages account as soon as possible. For more details
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/jjm/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.