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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.118955
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(12); e118955

Peer Review Report for "Identification of *Enterococcus faecalis* in Different Clonal Lineages with the Pulsed-Field Gel Electrophoresis Method in Imam Khomeini Hospital, Ilam, Iran"

Author(s): Farzad Mohammadi, Jalil Vand Yousefi, Naser Harzandi, Sobhan Ghafourian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Sep 2021
Revised Date: 22 Nov 2021
Accepted Date: 22 Nov 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) — 2 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
Many thanks for your submission, but by reading your manuscript, I found that
1. The results, discussion, and tables are correct but the method is poorly discussed in some sections.
In my opinion, if this reform of the results structure and discussion is carried out, this article is acceptable.
Thanks.

Zohreh Mashak: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 21 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Title is better changed to:Identification of Enterococcus faecalis in different clonal lineages with Pulsed-Field Gel Electrophoresis method in Imam Khomeini hospital, Ilam Iran
- Abstract:

Background, Material, and methods; Results and Conclusion must be written.
- There are many mistakes and topographical errors such as:
• Based on mentioned content, studying (?) and surveillance of E. faecalis strains are very necessary.
• In addition, they found the(?) on special genotype that was available in the 6 LVRE isolates and all.
• The results of our study demonstrated that there were thirty-two isolates, which belonged (?) to the same pulsotypes and all also were sensitive to vancomycin
• And…etc….
- Material and Methods:
• Urine samples related (age and sex and year and season)?????
• phenotyping methods for isolation and identification? (It isn't in Table 1)
• Which Statistical analysis.has used in this research?
Results:
• Must be rewrite and complete. (It is short)
• Table 1 and 2 and Fig 1 must be rewritten and corrected. and show the Statistically significant difference between them.
Discussion:
Use other new references in the discussion and explain the differences and reasons.
Thanks

Zohreh Mashak: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Oct 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major 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) 22 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

Regards

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Author
-Title is better change to:Identification of Enterococcus faecalis in different clonal lineages with Pulsed-Field Gel Electrophoresis method in Imam Khomeini hospital, Ilam Iran it was changed and highlighted
- Abstract:
Background, Material and methods; Results and Conclusion must be written. it was changed and highlighted
- There are many mistake and topographical error such as:
• Based on mentioned content, studding(?) and surveillance of E. faecalis strains are very necessary.
• In addition, they found the(?) on special genotype that was available in the 6 LVRE isolates and all .
• The results of our study demonstrated that, there were thirty-two isolates, which werebelong(?) to the same pulsotypes and all also were sensitive to vancomycin
• And…etc…. they were changed and highlighted

-Material and Methods:
• Urine samples related (age and sex and year and season)????? It was corrected and highlighted
• phenotyping methods for isolation and identification?(It isn't in Table 1)yes and corrected the phrase
• Which Statistical analysis.has used in this research? It was added and highlighted
Results:
• Must be rewrite and complete.(It is short) It was added and highlighted

• Table 1 and 2 and Flg 1 must be rewrite and correct. and show the Statistically significant difference between them .it just shows different pulsotypes

Discussion:
Use other new references in discussion and explain the differences and reasons.
.My decision is: major revision

Reviewer 2:
Many thanks for your submission, but by reading your manuscript, I found that
1. The results, discussion, and tables are correct but the method is poorly discussed in some sections. In my opinion, if this reform of the results structure and discussion is carried out, this article is acceptable. they were changed and highlighted

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Author

Dear Author
-Title is better change to:Identification of Enterococcus faecalis in different clonal lineages with Pulsed-Field Gel Electrophoresis method in Imam Khomeini hospital, Ilam Iran it was changed and highlighted
- Abstract:
Background, Material and methods; Results and Conclusion must be written. it was changed and highlighted
- There are many mistake and topographical error such as:
• Based on mentioned content, studding(?) and surveillance of E. faecalis strains are very necessary.
• In addition, they found the(?) on special genotype that was available in the 6 LVRE isolates and all .
• The results of our study demonstrated that, there were thirty-two isolates, which werebelong(?) to the same pulsotypes and all also were sensitive to vancomycin
• And…etc…. they were changed and highlighted

-Material and Methods:
• Urine samples related (age and sex and year and season)????? It was corrected and highlighted
• phenotyping methods for isolation and identification?(It isn't in Table 1)yes and corrected the phrase
• Which Statistical analysis.has used in this research? It was added and highlighted
Results:
• Must be rewrite and complete.(It is short) It was added and highlighted

• Table 1 and 2 and Flg 1 must be rewrite and correct. and show the Statistically significant difference between them .it just shows different pulsotypes

Discussion:
Use other new references in discussion and explain the differences and reasons.
.My decision is: major revision

Of course the JJM Has authority for final decision due to published another same paper entitled:"Multilocus Sequence Typing (MLST) of Enterococcus faecalis clinical isolates, Ilam, Iran " in J Bas Res Med Sci 2020; 7(4):31-35. With the same samples, Number and situations and also there is similar methods(identification and phenotypic methods and disk diffusion test for vancomycin resistance) in two paper With the exception of final step.So in my opinion it may be Salami and must be reject. Dear it was MLST and this is PFGE methods two different typing method

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) 22 Nov 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) 22 Nov 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.
Regards