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.117488
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(10); e117488

Peer Review Report for "Genotyping of *Escherichia coli* Causing Vaginal Infection in Dysplastic Patients with Similar Genetic Backgrounds Between Commensal and Virulent Strains"

Author(s): Clemente Cruz-Cruz, Emilio Mariano Durán-Manuel, Laura Delgado-Balbuena, Juan Carlos Bravata-Alcántara, Laura Margarita Márquez-Valdelamar, Gabriela Ibáñez-Cervantes, Iliana Alejandra Cortés-Ortíz, Mónica Alethia Cureño-Díaz, Josué Delgado-Balbuena, Gustavo Esteban Lugo-Zamudio, Juan Manuel Bello-López

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Jul 2021
Revised Date: 23 Oct 2021
Accepted Date: 23 Oct 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) — 28 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
In this study, the authors demonstrated that E coli of vaginal origin isolated from dysplastic patients carries virulence and resistance factors. the paper has been written well. However, there are some points that authors must be considered.
1. Phylogenetic assignment was performed by the use of yjaA, arpA, chuA and TSPE4.C2 genes. It is necessary to demonstrate some details about the assignment in the article.
2. It is necessary that the references should be updated.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:

1. In part “Resistance phenotype assay”, please explain how it was done? Disk diffusion results reported or MIC?
2. In part” DNA extraction and phylogenetic assignment”, please explain what the values of each of the items used in the multiplex PCR were?
3. In part” Molecular typing of Escherichia coli carrying identical genetic arrays”, please explain what the values of each of the items used in the ERIC-PCR were?
4. In the whole file, please note that the names of the bacteria are written in full when they are first mentioned (Escherichia coli), and after the first time, the abbreviation form (E. coli) can be used.
5. In the whole file, please make sure that the names of the genes and bacteria are Italic.
6. Note the spelling of the word “Cytotoxic” in Table 2.
7. Review the file grammatically.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 9 Oct 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)** 9 Oct 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.
1. 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.
2. 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. Moreover, add line numbers for text and put suitable line numbers for each response.
3. 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.
4. In addition, JJM INSTRUCTION is attached to the mail, pleases find it.
5. 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. 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 J Microbiol
Manuscript ID: 117488

Genotyping of *Escherichia coli* causing vaginal infection in dysplastic patients reveals similar genetic backgrounds between commensal and virulent strains

Reviewer 1:

In this study, the authors demonstrated that E. coli of vaginal origin isolated from dysplastic patients carries virulence and resistance factors. the paper has been written well. However, there is some points that authors must be considered.

Comment 1: *Phylogenetic assignment was performed by the use of yjaA, arpA, chuA and TSPE4.C2 genes. It is necessary to demonstrate some details about the assignment in the article.*

Answer to comment 1: The paragraph:

"The Wizard® Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega Corporation, Madison, USA), was used for extraction of total DNA. 16S rRNA gene was amplified in order to verify amplifiability of DNA samples (7). The phylogenetic assignment was performed by the use of four genes: *yjaA*, *arpA*, *chuA* and *TSPE4.C2* according to Clermont et al. (10). PCR multiplex conditions were pre-denaturation for 4 minutes at 94°C followed by up to 30 cycles of denaturation of 5 seconds at 94°C, annealing for 20 seconds at 59°C, and extension for 1 minute at 72°C, with a final extension for 5 minutes at 72°C. Primers used for this purpose are shown in Table 1."

Was modified as follow:

"The Wizard® Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega Corporation, Madison, USA), was used for extraction of total DNA. ***Prior to phylogenetic assignment,*** 16S rRNA gene was amplified in order to verify ***quality and*** amplifiability of DNA samples (7). ***Clermont et al., (10) proposed a dichotomous analysis based on the presence of the chuA, yjaA and arpA genes and the anonymous fragment designated as TspE4.C2 proposing six main phylogenetic groups*** in *E. coli* strains ***of different origins***. PCR multiplex conditions were pre-denaturation for 4 minutes at 94°C followed by up to 30 cycles of denaturation of 5 seconds at 94°C, annealing for 20 seconds at 59°C, and extension for 1 minute at 72°C, with a final extension for 5 minutes at 72°C. ***The PCR products were resolved on agarose gels and documented under UV light and ethidium bromide.*** Primers used for this purpose ***and length of PCR products*** are shown in Table 1."

Comment 2: *It is necessary that the references should be updated.*

Answer to comment 2: *We appreciate your valuable comment. We have updated the references that we consider can be updated since there are references that are unique in*

their type and must necessarily be used in the manuscript. The updated references were: 3, 5, 9 and 17.

Reviewer 2:

Comment 1: *In part "Resistance phenotype assay", please explain how it was done? Disk diffusion results reported or MIC?*

Answer to comment 1: *We appreciate your valuable comment. In the "Resistance phenotype assay" section the following is mentioned: "Escherichia coli strains were subjected to antimicrobial resistance phenotype. For this purpose, the disk diffusion test was performed according to the protocol established by "The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute" (CLSI) (9), on the surface of Mueller-Hinton agar plates". Therefore, results reported was performed by "disk diffusion"*

Comment 2*: In part" DNA extraction and phylogenetic assignment", please explain what the values of each of the items used in the multiplex PCR were?*

Answer to comment 2: The paragraph:

"The Wizard® Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega Corporation, Madison, USA), was used for extraction of total DNA. 16S rRNA gene was amplified in order to verify amplifiability of DNA samples (7). The phylogenetic assignment was performed by the use of four genes: *yjaA, arpA, chuA* and *TSPE4.C2* according to Clermont et al. (10). PCR multiplex conditions were pre-denaturation for 4 minutes at 94°C followed by up to 30 cycles of denaturation of 5 seconds at 94°C, annealing for 20 seconds at 59°C, and extension for 1 minute at 72°C, with a final extension for 5 minutes at 72°C. Primers used for this purpose are shown in Table 1."

Was modified as follow:

"The Wizard® Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega Corporation, Madison, USA), was used for extraction of total DNA. ***Prior to phylogenetic assignment,*** 16S rRNA gene was amplified in order to verify ***quality and*** amplifiability of DNA samples (7). ***Clermont et al., (10) proposed a dichotomous analysis based on the presence of the chuA, yjaA and arpA genes and the anonymous fragment designated as TspE4.C2 proposing six main phylogenetic groups*** in *E. coli* strains of different origins. PCR multiplex conditions were pre-denaturation for 4 minutes at 94°C followed by up to 30 cycles of denaturation of 5 seconds at 94°C, annealing for 20 seconds at 59°C, and extension for 1 minute at 72°C, with a final extension for 5 minutes at 72°C. ***The PCR products were resolved on agarose gels and documented under UV light and ethidium bromide.*** Primers used for this purpose ***and length of PCR products*** are shown in Table 1."

Comment 3: *In part" Molecular typing of Escherichia coli carrying identical genetic arrays", please explain what the values of each of the items used in the ERIC-PCR were?*

Answer to comment 3: In "*3.6. Molecular typing of Escherichia coli carrying identical genetic arrays section", **the sentence:***

"Strains carrying identical genetic arrays (gene cassettes) in class 1 integrons, were analyzed by ERIC-PCR to differentiate between unique strains and clones (*n*=12)".

was modified as follow:

"Strains carrying identical genetic arrays (gene cassettes) in class 1 integrons, were analyzed by ERIC-PCR to differentiate between unique strains and clones (*n*=12). **The criterion for clone identification criteria was based on the dichotomous variable (presence or absence of amplified intergenic regions in isolates with identical genetic arrangements in the variable region of integrons detected in *E. coli* strains).**"

Comment 4: *In the whole file, please note that the names of the bacteria are written in full when they are first mentioned (Escherichia coli), and after the first time, the abbreviation form (E. coli) can be used.*

Answer to comment 4: *The manuscript was revised in its entirety and abbreviations that had been omitted have been corrected.*

Comment 5:*In the whole file, please make sure that the names of the genes and bacteria are Italic.*

Answer to comment 5: *Names of the genes and bacteria were corrected.*

Comment 6: *Note the spelling of the word "Cytotoxic" in Table 2.*

Answer to comment 6: *The word **"Cytotoxic"** in Table 2 was modified.*

Comment 7: *Review the file grammatically.*

Answer to comment 7: *The all manuscript was grammatically Reviewed.*

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) 23 Oct 2021

Dear EIC
The manuscript was completely revised based on reviewers and associated editor comments and it is acceptable for publishing in JJM.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Oct 2021

Dear Authors,
I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the JJM. Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department. If we need additional information from you during the production process, we will contact you directly. Please remember to always include your manuscript number, whenever inquiring about your manuscript. We will create a proof which you will be asked to check. When you receive the proof, 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
We appreciate you submitting your manuscript to JJM and hope you will consider us again for future submissions.
Thanks.