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.119858
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 14(11); e119858

Peer Review Report for "A New Colorimetric Method for Rapid Detection of Antibiotic Resistance in *Escherichia coli* Isolates"

Author(s): Mehmet Akif Gun, Yeliz Tanriverdi Cayci, Belma Durupinar, Ahmet Yilmaz Coban

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Oct 2021
Revised Date: 4 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
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) — 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 Editor,

Here we listed our response to suggestions of the reviewers.

1- Why did authors choose *Escherichia coli*?

Members of Enterobacterales are the most isolated bacteria from clinical specimens. E. coli is also the most frequently isolated bacteria from clinical specimens among the Enterobacterales members. Therefore, we primarily aimed to test *E. coli* isolates in our study.

2- The text is full for graphical mistakes. All text should revise by a native English speaker.

The grammer of the text was checked and corrected.

3- Only scientific names should be italic. The Escherichia is not scientific name. Additionally, the names of genes should be italic. *Escherichia coli* should be italic.

It was checked and corrected.

4- Some references are needed to add in the method section.

New references were added.

5- Please add ethical consideration.

The Ethical approvement of the study form the Ondokuz Mayis University Faculty of Medicine Clinical Ethics committee was presented in the method section.

6- If it is possible, please compare the findings of Colorimetric Method with disk diffusion as a gold standard.

Broth microdilution method is recommended by CLSI as a reference method for determination of MIC values. In this study we aimed to determine the MIC values of the tested isolates by resazurin microplate method. Therefore it was better to use broth microdilution method as a reference method for comparison of MIC values. If we only intended to compare categorical agreement, we could use the disk diffusion method.

7- Please add the advantageous of Colorimetric Method in the text.

Colorimetric methods are methods that provide MIC values and susceptibility status of the antimicrobials in a short time with less material and without the need for a device by this way these methods can be easily applied in many laboratories.

8- Please add the dis-advantageous of Colorimetric Method in the text.

The main disadvantages of colorimetric methods include difficulty in obtaining antibiotic powders and sometimes difficulty in evaluating color change in the tests.

9- Please add the valid method of *E. coli* isolation and identification by valid reference.

“The identification of the isolates were performed by both conventional methods (Gram staining, colony morphology on %5 sheep blood agar and EMB agar plates) and Maldi-tof MS (Vitek MS, Biomeriux, France).” This part was added to the text.

10- Please add negative and positive controls in your method.

The first well was used as the growth control well and the last well as the sterility control well .Also reference isolates were used in the tests.

11- Discussion was not designed well. Authors should interpreted their findings and compare them with those of other studies.

Discussion section was rewritten.

12- What is the main conclusion of this survey?

The resazurin microplate method has yielded very good results when compared with the reference broth microdilution method, and can be a preferred as a method for susceptibility tests in laboratories with limited facilities, since it does not require a device and is easy to apply.

13- What is the limitations of this survey?

The number of clinical isolates and antibiotics studied could have been increased. The Resazurin Microplate Method could be tested in many centers.

14- What is the main strongpoints of this survey?

Resazurin microplate method is a good alternative method for the laboratories that cannot use automated system.

15- Grammatical mistakes were the most important defects.

The mistakes were checked.

16- Is there any differences between Gram negative and positive bacteria in the colorimetric method?

We did not test Gram positive in the content of this study. However, when we checked the literatüre there are no main differences between testing Gram negative and positive bacteria in the resazurin colorimetric method, there are some differences in the amount of resazurin that added to the plates.

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 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** (1) 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.
Regards