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-119480
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 15(2); e119480

Peer Review Report for "Investigation of *OXA-23*, *OXA-24*, *OXA-40*, *OXA-51*, and *OXA-58* Genes in Carbapenem-Resistant *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Isolates from Patients with Urinary Tract Infections"

Author(s): Elmira Pourbaghi, Reza Hosseini Doust, Mohammad Rahbar, Marjan Rahnamaye Farzami

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	10 Oct 2021
Revised Date:	17 Feb 2022
Accepted Date:	6 Apr 2022

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) 18 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- The manuscript should be revised grammatically.
2- Some abbreviations are not specified.
3- The order of writing in the whole text must be observed.
4- Image-related descriptions must be provided before the image.
5- In some parts of the manuscript the author uses Hard-to-read text. Rewrite.
6- Some sentences require the use of related references.
7- Some sections of the manuscript contain incomprehensible sentences. Rewrite.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 14 Jan 2022

Dear AE,

Although the type of investigation is interesting but there are major points that have to be clarified which are as follow:

Title:

1- Line 1: Evaluation of OXA group genes among carbapenam (carbapenem)-…

Abstract:

2- “OXA group genes” can be used as a keyword.

Background:

3- Examples from similar studies are not presented sufficiently.

Objectives:

4- This part of manuscript is not written clearly and better to be rewritten.

Materials and Methods:

5- Following sentence should be rewritten. It is better to not mention the name of bacteria at first and mentioning only the word “isolates” would be sufficient:

“Five hundred urine isolates of E. coli and K. pneumoniae were isolated from patients with UTI symptoms hospitalized at Milad hospital during 2017-2018. The reconfirmation of the isolates 59 was performed by standard biochemical methods.”

6- Two time the E-test have been mentioned in this section, therefore one of them should be deleted:

Lines 59-60 and Line 62-62

7- Following sentence should be revised:

“The MIC was determined for antibiotics including ceftazidime (CAZ), ceftriaxone (CRO), meropenem (MEM), ciprofloxacin (CIP), piperacillin/tazobactam (TZP), gentamicin (GEN), amoxicillin-clavulanate (AMC) and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (SXT) for all isolates, using E-test standard methods.”

8- Resistant to carbapenem or Carbapeneme resistance instead of “Carbapenem resistance confirmation”

9- Following sentence (line 68-75) is too long and should be divided at least to two sub sentences, also they should be written more appropriately:

“A group of isolates has also been tested for the activity of carbapenemase with Carba-NP as defined by CLSI. The recommended standard strains were used with each day of testing. One inoculation loop (10 µl) of the isolate, recovered from Mueller-Hinton Agar (BD Ltd, USA), was re-suspended in 200 µl of 0.02% acetyl trimethyl ammonium bromide (CTAB) (Merck, Germany); so 100 µl of the cell suspension was added to 100 µl of diluted phenol red (Merck, Germany) solution including 0.1 mM ZnSO4 (Merck,Germany) (pH = 7.5) added with 6 mg/ml of imipenem (SciENcelab, Inc.).”

10- In the following sentence (line 77-78) positive and negative control could be explained in better way:

“The color change of the test tube to full yellow or orange is the representative of carbapenemase-producing isolate while the control tube remained red (12).”

11- Line 89-90: “Then, the last extension step was done at 72C (72°C) for 5 min.”

12- Line 94-97: “The MLVA was performed using seven tandem sequence repeats (CVN001, CVN002, CVN003, CVN004, CVN007, CVN014, CVN015) that were (previously) explained by Lindstedt et al. (14) (Table 2).” The previously published primers (14) were used for MLVA (Table 2).

Results:

13- Line 119-121: “Women had more urinary tract infection (190 cases of K. pneumoniae and 150 cases of E. coli) tract infections than men (80 cases for K. pneumoniae and 80 cases for E.coli).”

14- Line 121-123: The most prevalent UTI with E. coli were observed in the 70-79 years (what? Patient?), while the most prevalent UTI with K. pneumoniae were found in the 51-59 years (what? Patient?).”

15- Line 124: “Figure 1: Distribution of UTI cases by sex (gender).”

16- Following sentences (Lines 132-139) should be revised and rewritten:

“The exact data of susceptibility test have been shown by Figure 3. As 60.6% (95% C.I., 54.0 to 66.9), 58% (95% C.I., 51.3 to 64.4) and 51.5% (95% C.I., 44.9 to 58.1) of E. coli isolates were resistant against SXT, CRO and CIP, respectively. 3% (95% C.I., 1.3 to 6.4) and 6.5 % (95% C.I., 3.8 to 10.7) of E. coli isolates were resistant to MEM and TZP (Figure 3, A). 47.2% (95% C.I., 41.1 to 53.3), 40.1% (95% C.I., 34.2 to 42.2), 39.2% (95% C.I., 30.7 to 42.5) and 36.4% (95% C.I., 27.6 to 39.1) of K .pneumoniae isolates were resistant to CRO, CAZ, SXT and AMC, respectively. 10% (95% C.I., 4.2 to 15.8) and 12.3 % (95% C.I., 8.7 to 17) of K. pneumoniae isolates were resistant to MEM and TZP (Figure 3, B).”

17- Line 140: Figure 3: The status of antimicrobial susceptibility results of isolates.

18- Lines 142-144: Two following sentences are better to be united:

“Moreover, 33.3% carbapenem-resistant E. coli isolates were susceptible to SXT. Also, 25%, 8.3% and 4.2% carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae isolates were susceptible to SXT, GEN and TZP.”

19- Line 145: The status (frequency??) of OXA-group gene in E. coli and K. pneumoniae isolates.

20- Lines 147- 148: In addition, 9 (3.9%) of E. coli isolates and 7(2.6%) of the K. pneumoniae isolates carried a gene encoding an OXA-51-like enzyme, respectively.

21- Lines 154-158: Two following sentences should be combined:

“Figure 4 summarizes the presence of the OXA-group genes that can encode the carbapenemases in carbapenem-resistant E. coli and K. pneumoniae, including OXA-23, OXA-24, OXA-40, OXA-51 and OXA-58-like groups (indicating that) 6 (46.1%) and 7 (26%) of carbapenem-resistant E. coli and K. pneumoniae isolates had a gene encoding a β-lactamase of the OXA-23-like group.”

22- Lines 175-176: As figure 6A shows K.pneumoniae isolates divide into 3 MLVA patterns and a singleton (Figure 6A).

23- Lines 175- 177: Two following sentences should first corrected (as above) and then be unified:

“As figure 6A shows K.pneumoniae isolates divide into 3 MLVA patterns and a singleton (Figure 6). Figure 6B shows E. coli isolates divide into 2 MLVA patterns (cutoff of 80%) (Figure 6).”

Discussion:

24- Line 180: In this study, in both sexes (genders) and… isolated bacteria are (were)

25- Line 185: ampicillin, amoxicillin, cephalexin and chloramphenicol was obtained (reported or recorded) 100%. Moreover

26- Lines 189-190: “Therefore, location and time of study affect the pattern of antibiotic resistance and can affect antibiotic use (Ref???).”

27- Line 200: “respectively, while K. pneumoniae isolates demonstrate (showed) resistance

rates of 100% to ampicillin”

28- Lines 207-208: “The resistance amounts of both strains to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole and ciprofloxacin were more than ours.” What does it mean by ours in this sentence?

29- Except two following paragraphs (lines 259-262, and 263-266) which advised to be revised, the rest of discussion has been well written:

According to dendrogram, the significant portion of our isolates related to one main clone that showed the low level of infection control methods and the vertical transmission of resistant strains, while some isolates did not show the clonal spread. The dissemination of these isolates was probably regarding to the transfer of mobile genetic elements in studied genes.

The present study had some limitations. Firstly, it was done in a general hospital, so shows a little part of the total population, and the results cannot be compared to other settings because specific epidemiology of various places. Secondary, lack of clinical information is the further limitation of our study.

Conclusion

30- Line 268: In conclusion, our study showed that...

31- That is suggested to refer to other novel results obtained in this research in conclusion such as the frequency of antibiotic resistant among bacterial isolates.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Jan 2022

Dear EIC,

According to reviewer’s comments, manuscript can be considered for publication after major revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 15 Jan 2022

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details mentioned above carefully according to the reviewers' request.

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 Reviewer1

Thank you for your attention and important comments.

Title:

1- Line 1: Evaluation of OXA group genes among carbapenam (carbapenem)-…

Author Answer: Line 1: Evaluation of OXA group genes among carbapenam **was modified to** Evaluation of OXA group genes among carbapenem …

Abstract:

2- “OXA group genes” can be used as a keyword.

Author Answer: Line 26: OXA group genes were used as a keyword.

Background:

3- Examples from similar studies are not presented sufficiently.

Author Answer: Line 52-58: Examples from similar studies were added.

Objectives:
4- This part of manuscript is not written clearly and better to be rewritten.

Author Answer: Line 60-62: This part of manuscript was modified and rewritten.

Materials and Methods:

5- Following sentence should be rewritten. It is better to not mention the name of bacteria at first and mentioning only the word “isolates” would be sufficient:

“Five hundred urine isolates of E. coli and K. pneumoniae were isolated from patients with UTI symptoms hospitalized at Milad hospital during 2017-2018. The reconfirmation of the isolates 59 was performed by standard biochemical methods.”

Author Answer: Line 65-67: **This part of manuscript was modified and rewritten:** Five hundred urine isolates were isolated from patients with UTI symptoms hospitalized at Milad Hospital during 2017-2018. The reconfirmation of the isolates was performed by standard biochemical methods.

6- Two time the E-test have been mentioned in this section, therefore one of them should be deleted: Lines 59-60 and Line 62-62

Author Answer: Lines 67-72: This segments were modified.

7- Following sentence should be revised:
“The MIC was determined for antibiotics including ceftazidime (CAZ), ceftriaxone (CRO), meropenem (MEM), ciprofloxacin (CIP), piperacillin/tazobactam (TZP), gentamicin (GEN), amoxicillin-clavulanate (AMC) and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (SXT) for all isolates, using E-test standard methods.”

Author Answer: Line 70-74: **This segments were modified to:** The MIC was performed for ceftazidime (CAZ), ceftriaxone (CRO), meropenem (MEM), ciprofloxacin (CIP), piperacillin/tazobactam (TZP), gentamicin (GEN), amoxicillin-clavulanate (AMC) and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (SXT). The result was reported as resistant, intermediate, and susceptible according to M100-CLSI 2021 guidelines (14).

8- Resistant to carbapenem or Carbapeneme resistance instead of "Carbapenem resistance confirmation"

Author Answer: Line 75: Carbapeneme resistance instead of "Carbapenem resistance confirmation" was rewritten.

9- Following sentence (line 68-75) is too long and should be divided at least to two sub sentences, also they should be written more appropriately: "A group of isolates has also been tested for the activity of carbapenemase with Carba-NP as defined by CLSI. The recommended standard strains were used with each day of testing. One inoculation loop (10 µl) of the isolate, recovered from Mueller-Hinton Agar (BD Ltd, USA), was re-suspended in 200 µl of 0.02% acetyl trimethyl ammonium bromide (CTAB) (Merck, Germany); so 100 µl of the cell suspension was added to 100 µl of diluted phenol red (Merck, Germany) solution including 0.1 mM ZnSO4 (Merck,Germany) (pH = 7.5) added with 6 mg/ml of imipenem (SciENcelab, Inc.)."

Author Answer: Line 76-79: "A group of isolates has also been tested for the activity of carbapenemase with Carba-NP as defined by CLSI. The recommended standard strains were used with each day of testing. One inoculation loop (10 µl) of the isolate, recovered from Mueller-Hinton Agar (BD Ltd, USA), was re-suspended in 200 µl of 0.02% acetyl trimethyl ammonium bromide (CTAB) (Merck, Germany); so 100 µl of the cell suspension was added to 100 µl of diluted phenol red (Merck, Germany) solution including 0.1 mM ZnSO4 (Merck,Germany) (pH = 7.5) added with 6 mg/ml of imipenem (SciENcelab, Inc.)." **This segment was modified to:** The isolates has also been tested for the activity of carbapenemase with Carba-NP according to the CLSI guideline and manufacturer instructions. The color change of the test tube to full yellow or orange confirmed carbapenemase-producing isolates while the control tube remained red {Rudresh, 2017 #33}(15).

10- In the following sentence (line 77-78) positive and negative control could be explained in better way: "The color change of the test tube to full yellow or orange is the representative of carbapenemase-producing isolate while the control tube remained red (12)."

Author Answer: Line 77-79: **This segment was modified to:** The color change of the test tube to full yellow or orange confirmed carbapenemase-producing isolates while the control tube remained red {Rudresh, 2017 #33}(15).

11- Line 89-90: "Then, the last extension step was done at 72C (72°C) for 5 min."

Author Answer: Line 91: **This sentence was modified to:** Then, the last extension step was done at 72°C for 5 min.

12- Line 94-97: “The MLVA was performed using seven tandem sequence repeats (CVN001, CVN002, CVN003, CVN004, CVN007, CVN014, CVN015) that were (previously) explained by Lindstedt et al. (14) (Table 2).” The previously published primers (14) were used for MLVA (Table 2).

Author Answer: Line 95-98: This segment was modified to: The MLVA was performed using seven tandem sequence repeats (CVN001, CVN002, CVN003, CVN004, CVN007, CVN014, CVN015) that were previously explained by Lindstedt et al. (17). The previously published primers (17) were used for MLVA (Table 2).

Results:
13- Line 119-121: “Women had more urinary tract infection (190 cases of K. pneumoniae and 150 cases of E. coli) tract infections than men (80 cases for K. pneumoniae and 80 cases for E.coli).”

Author Answer: Line 120-122: **This sentence was modified to:** Women had more urinary tract infections (190 cases of K. pneumoniae and 150 cases of E. coli) than men (80 cases for K. pneumoniae and 80 cases for E.coli).

14- Line 121-123: The most prevalent UTI with E. coli were observed in the 70-79 years (what? Patient?), while the most prevalent UTI with K. pneumoniae were found in the 51-59 years (what? Patient?).”

Author Answer: Line 122-124: **This segment was modified to:** The most prevalent UTI with E. coli was observed in the 70–79-year patients, while the most prevalent UTI with K. pneumoniae was found in the 51–59-year patients.

15- Line 124: “Figure 1: Distribution of UTI cases by sex (gender).”

Author Answer: Line 125: “Figure 1: Distribution of UTI cases by sex **was modified to** Figure 1. Distribution of UTI cases by gender

16- Following sentences (Lines 132-139) should be revised and rewritten: “The exact data of susceptibility test have been shown by Figure 3. As 60.6% (95% C.I., 54.0 to 66.9), 58% (95% C.I., 51.3 to 64.4) and 51.5% (95% C.I., 44.9 to 58.1) of E. coli isolates were resistant against SXT, CRO and CIP, respectively. 3% (95% C.I., 1.3 to 6.4) and 6.5 % (95% C.I., 3.8 to 10.7) of E. coli isolates were resistant to MEM and TZP (Figure 3, A). 47.2% (95% C.I., 41.1 to 53.3), 40.1% (95% C.I., 34.2 to 42.2), 39.2% (95% C.I., 30.7 to 42.5) and 36.4% (95% C.I., 27.6 to 39.1) of K .pneumoniae isolates were resistant to CRO, CAZ, SXT and AMC, respectively. 10% (95% C.I., 4.2 to 15.8) and 12.3 % (95% C.I., 8.7 to 17) of K. pneumoniae isolates were resistant to MEM and TZP (Figure 3, B).”

Author Answer: Line 132-136: **This segment was modified to:** As shown in Figure 3, 60.6%, 58% and 51.5% of E. coli isolates were resistant against SXT, CRO and CIP, respectively. Also, 3% and 6.5 % of E. coli isolates were resistant to MEM and TZP (Figure 3A). 47.2%, 40.1%, 39.2% and 36.4% of K .pneumoniae isolates were resistant to CRO, CAZ, SXT and AMC,

respectively. 10% and 12.3 % of K. pneumoniae isolates were resistant to MEM and TZP as well. (Figure 3B).

17- Line 140: Figure 3: The status of antimicrobial susceptibility results of isolates.

Author Answer: Line 137-138: Figure 3: The status of antimicrobial susceptibility results of isolates **was modified to: Figure 3.** The status of antimicrobial susceptibility results of isolates. A) E.coli, B) K. pneumoniae

18- Lines 142-144: Two following sentences are better to be united: “Moreover, 33.3% carbapenem-resistant E. coli isolates were susceptible to SXT. Also, 25%, 8.3% and 4.2% carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae isolates were susceptible to SXT, GEN and TZP.”

Author Answer: Line 140-142: Moreover, 33.3% of carbapenem-resistant E. coli isolates to SXT and 25%, 8.3% and 4.2% carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae isolates to SXT, GEN and TZP were susceptible.

19- Line 145: The status (frequency??) of OXA-group gene in E. coli and K. pneumoniae isolates.

Author Answer: Line 143: The frequency of OXA-group gene in E. coli and K. pneumoniae isolates

20- Lines 147- 148: In addition, 9 (3.9%) of E. coli isolates and 7(2.6%) of the K. pneumoniae isolates carried a gene encoding an OXA-51-like enzyme, respectively.

Author Answer: Line 145-146: **This sentence was modified to:** In addition, 9 (3.9%) of E. coli isolates and 7 (2.6%) of the K. pneumoniae isolates carried a gene encoding of OXA-51-like enzyme, respectively.

21- Lines 154-158: Two following sentences should be combined: “Figure 4 summarizes the presence of the OXA-group genes that can encode the carbapenemases in carbapenem-resistant E. coli and K. pneumoniae, including OXA-23, OXA-24, OXA-40, OXA-51 and OXA-58-like groups (indicating that) 6 (46.1%) and 7 (26%) of carbapenem-resistant E. coli and K. pneumoniae isolates had a gene encoding a β-lactamase of the OXA-23-like group.”

Author Answer: Line 152-156: **This segment was modified to:** Figure 4 summarizes the presence of the OXA-group genes that can encode the carbapenemases in carbapenem-resistant E. coli and K. pneumoniae, including OXA-23, OXA-24, OXA-40, OXA-51 and OXA-58-like groups indicating that 6 (46.1%) and 7 (26%) of carbapenem-resistant E. coli and K. pneumoniae isolates had a gene encoding a β-lactamase of the OXA-23-like group.

22- Lines 175-176: As figure 6A shows K.pneumoniae isolates divide into 3 MLVA patterns and a singleton (Figure 6A).

Author Answer: Line 173-175: **This segment was modified to:** The analysis of figure 6A and 6B showed that K. pneumoniae isolates were divided into 3 MLVA patterns and a singleton (Figure 6A) and E. coli isolates were displayed 2 MLVA patterns (Figure 6B).

23- Lines 175- 177: Two following sentences should first corrected (as above) and then be unified:
"As figure 6A shows K.pneumoniae isolates divide into 3 MLVA patterns and a singleton (Figure 6). Figure 6B shows E. coli isolates divide into 2 MLVA patterns (cutoff of 80%) (Figure 6)."

Author Answer: Line 173-175: **This segment was modified to:** The analysis of figure 6A and 6B showed that K. pneumoniae isolates were divided into 3 MLVA patterns and a singleton (Figure 6A) and E. coli isolates were displayed 2 MLVA patterns (Figure 6B).

Discussion:

24- Line 180: In this study, in both sexes (genders) and… isolated bacteria are (were)

Author Answer: Line 178-179: **This segment was modified to:** In this study, in both genders and all age groups, the most common delivered bacteria were Escherichia coli and Klebsiella pneumoniae.

25- Line 185: ampicillin, amoxicillin, cephalexin and chloramphenicol was obtained (reported or recorded) 100%. Moreover

Author Answer: Line 183: ampicillin, amoxicillin, cephalexin and chloramphenicol was reported 100%.

26- Lines 189-190: "Therefore, location and time of study affect the pattern of antibiotic resistance and can affect antibiotic use (Ref???)."

Author Answer: Line 187-188: **References were added.** Therefore, location and time of study affect the pattern of antibiotic resistance and can affect antibiotic use (16, 21-27).

27- Line 200: "respectively, while K. pneumoniae isolates demonstrate (showed) resistance rates of 100% to ampicillin"

Author Answer: Line 198: "respectively, while K. pneumoniae isolates demonstrate resistance rates of 100% to ampicillin" **was modified to:** respectively, while K. pneumoniae isolates showed resistance rates of 100% to ampicillin

28- Lines 207-208: "The resistance amounts of both strains to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole and ciprofloxacin were more than ours." What does it mean by ours in this sentence?

Author Answer: Line 205-206: The resistance amounts of both strains to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole and ciprofloxacin were more than ours **was modified to**: In Lina's study, the resistance amounts of both strains to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole and ciprofloxacin were more than those in our study.

29- Except two following paragraphs (lines 259-262, and 263-266) which advised to be revised, the rest of discussion has been well written:
According to dendrogram, the significant portion of our isolates related to one main clone that showed the low level of infection control methods and the vertical transmission of resistant strains, while some isolates did not show the clonal spread. The dissemination of these isolates was probably regarding to the transfer of mobile genetic elements in studied genes.
The present study had some limitations. Firstly, it was done in a general hospital, so shows a little part of the total population, and the results cannot be compared to other settings because specific epidemiology of various places. Secondary, lack of clinical information is the further limitation of our study.

Author Answer: Line 257-260: **This segment was revised and rewritten to:** According to dendrogram (figure 6A & 6B), carbapenem-resistant isolates have originated from one main clone and have been spread in the hospital causing the low level of infection control methods and the vertical transmission of resistant strains, while the dissemination of some isolates was probably due to the transfer of mobile genetic elements in the genes studied.

Conclusion
30- Line 268: In conclusion, our study showed that...

Author Answer: Line 262: In conclusion, our study showed that...**was revised to:** Our study showed that…

31- That is suggested to refer to other novel results obtained in this research in conclusion such as the frequency of antibiotic resistant among bacterial isolates.

Author Answer: Line 262-263: **This segment was revised and rewritten to:** Our study showed that all carbapenem-resistant E. coli and K. pneumoniae isolates were ESBL-producing and resistant to CRO, CIP, MEM, CAZ and AMP.

Dear Reviewer2

Thank you for your attention and important comments.

1- The manuscript should be revised grammatically.

Author Answer: The manuscript was revised grammatically.

2- Some abbreviations are not specified.

Author Answer: All abbreviations were checked and revised.

3- The order of writing in the whole text must be observed.

Author Answer: The order of writing in the whole text was checked and revised by author guide.

4- Image-related descriptions must be provided before the image.

Author Answer: Image-related descriptions were provided before the image in the manuscript.

5- In some parts of the manuscript the author uses Hard-to-read text. Rewrite.

Author Answer: The manuscript was rewrite.

6- Some sentences require the use of related references.

Author Answer: Related references were added in lines 58, 74, 205 and 222, … .

7- Some sections of the manuscript contain incomprehensible sentences. Rewrite.

Author Answer: All sections of the manuscript were revised and rewritten and checked grammatically.

Best regards

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) 6 Apr 2022

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) 6 Apr 2022

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.