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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm118107
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(11); e118107

Peer Review Report for "Five-year Surveillance of Antimicrobial Resistance Changes and Epidemiological Characteristics in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: A Retrospective Study in a Chinese City Hospital"

Author(s): Yuhui Wang, Jie Ma, Wanxiang Li, Mi Liu, Yansheng Ding

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	24 Jul 2021
Revised Date:	5 Dec 2021
Accepted Date:	6 Dec 2021

Revision (0)

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

Farhad Safarpoor Dehkordi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 Oct 2021

Dear EIC,
Comments to authors:
1- The text is full of graphical mistakes. All text should revise by a native English speaker.
2- In the abstract, the authors said: Method: From 2015 to 2019, P. aeruginosa isolates were collected. However, the exact numbers of isolates were unknown.
3- The introduction is too short. The authors should add the main importance of their study in this section. Additionally, they should answer the question that why other investigations cannot answer the main idea of this paper? Additionally, what is the main novelty of this research?
4- Please add ethical consideration.
5- Please add the valid method of Pseudomonas aeruginosa isolation and identification by

valid reference.
6- How do the authors do the disk diffusion? What was your reference? Did you use the CLSI principles? Please add its reference.
7- Please add the negative and positive control for antimicrobial susceptibility testing.
8- How did the authors choose their antimicrobial disks?
9- The discussion was too short. Authors should interpret their findings and compare them with those of other studies.
10- What is the main conclusion of this survey?
11- What are the limitations of this survey?
12- What are the main strong points of this survey?
13- Grammatical mistakes were the most important defects.
CHEERS'
FSD

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Nov 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.

Dear Professor

We are very grateful to your comments for the manuscript. According to your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript. All of your questions were answered one-by-one.

1 We are very sorry for the grammatical errors in the manuscript, so we have revised it according to a professional English editing service company.

2 The exact numbers of isolates (3324) has been added in abstract section.

3 The introduction has been extended. Due to few studies have analyzed ABR of P. aeruginosa isolates in tandem with patients' clinical characteristics over a long follow-up period. Therefore, we investigated ABR among inpatient-derived P. aeruginosa isolates and the clinical characteristics of the affected patients in our hospital from 2015 to 2019. Our overall goal was to identify factors related to ABR and any changes in the epidemiology of P. aeruginosa over time.

4 We obtained and archived the written consent obtained from all the patients included in this study, and the ethics committee of Weifang People's Hospital approved the study and its use of samples from human patients.

5 All strains were characterized using a VITEK-2 compact instrument (bioMérieux, France) according to the guidelines from the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) (7). All strains were isolated on Columbia blood plates (bioMérieux) prior to being characterized. Single colonies were used to make a 0.5 McFarland turbidity standard suspension.

6 Disk diffusion testing was performed on Muller-Hinton agar (Oxoid, UK) with the following disks: aztreonam (ATM), cefoperazone-sulbactam (CSL), piperacillin (PRL), and meropenem (MEM). The chosen of these disk were according to the guidelines from the CLSI. The reference has been added.

7 P. aeruginosa ATCC 27853 and Escherichia coli ATCC25922 were used as controls for ABR.

8 The chosen of these disk were according to the guidelines from the CLSI. The reference has been added.

9 we have extended the discussion and interpreted our findings and compare them with those of other studies

10The main conclusion of this survey is that the isolation rate for CRPA, MDRPA, and XDRPA strains decreased over the past 5 years. This does not consistent with our belief of increasing resistance rates.

11 The limitations of this survey is that this was a single-center retrospective study. In the future, we plan to conduct a multicenter study to compare differences in ABR and the pathogenic characteristics of P. aeruginosa.

12 The main strongpoints of this survey is that this study combined analysis of ABR and the pathogenic characteristics of P. aeruginosa.

13Grammatical mistakes were modified according to a professional English editing service company.

We appreciate for your warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

12.3.2021

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)** 4 Dec 2021

Dear EIC
Although the authors revised the manuscript according to reviewer comments, however, a few corrections must be applied before publication as:
1) Add a subheading introduction in “ABSTRACT” and put 3-4 sentences for this section.
2) Separate “OBJECTIVES” of study from “INTRODUCTION” and put in a separate subheading.
3) Summarize final conclusions into 4-5 sentences.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 4 Dec 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 (2)

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 Edotor

We are very grateful to your comments for the manuscript. According to your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript. All of your questions were answered one-by-one.

1 We are very sorry for missing the background in “ABSTRACT”. In the revision we have added the subheading “background” and put 3 sentences for this section.

2 The “OBJECTIVES” has been separated of study from “INTRODUCTION” and put in a separate subheading.

3 The conclusion has been partially reduced to 4 sentences.

We appreciate for your warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Wanxiang Li

12.5.2021

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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** (2) 6 Dec 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** (2) 6 Dec 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.