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.120027
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 15(1); e120027

Peer Review Report for "Occurrence of Hypervirulent *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Clinical Settings and Lytic Potential of Bacteriophages Against the Isolates"

Author(s): Moeed Ahmad, Abu Baker Siddique, Saima Muzammil, Muhammad Shafique, Zeeshan Nawaz, Mohsin Khurshid, Muhammad Hidayat Rasool, Muhammad Moazam Jalees, Noreen Sarwar, Bilal Aslam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	6 Oct 2021
Revised Date:	18 Jan 2022
Accepted Date:	18 Jan 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) — 11 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors,
1- The host range determination is unclear in the material and method part, except for the K. pneumoniae, which bacterial hosts were used?
2- The statistical calculation is contradictory.
3- The isolated phages were not precisely defined.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Abstract: please correct: Change “MDR “to “MDR (Multi-Drug Resistant)”

- Keywords: Change:" Phages; MDR, Klebsiella pneumoniae, CDC, endolysins" to " Phages; MDR, Klebsiella pneumonia"
- Material and method: Which standard positive microorganism has been used for antimicrobial susceptibility testing.
Also, please write the full acronym such as "LB" and "FBS" in Material and Method
- Discussion: Please discuss all parts of the results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 12 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
This paper is entitled" Occurrence of hypervirulent Klebsiella pneumoniae in clinical settings and lytic potential of bacteriophages against the isolates" .
There are many topographical and editing mistakes in this paper such as:
- "Patients infected with hvKp along with liver abscess can also suffer from metastasis of eye, lung, and CNS other infections" and, The degree of Celsius for incubations, Italicizing bacterial species in references.
- Abstract: How many clinical samples have been used in this study?
- Material and Methods: Please mention reference "For plaque assay, the double agar overlay method was used"
- Discussion: Use more new references and expand it.
Thanks.

Zohreh Mashak: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 18 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
There are many mistakes in the edition and writing such as (a nonitalic form of all bacterial species in References, C for some temperatures, CNS other infections, HAI's and etc.
Comments for the authors:
- Write Reference of Phage adsorption assay.
- Correct and rewrite Keywords.
- Please explain the difference between data of Pus and Tracheal aspirate (Table :1) in the Discussion.
- Use other new references in the discussion.
- More clear and determine isolated different phages.
Thanks.

Zohreh Mashak: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Nov 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) 19 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:

Thanks for the valuable comments from your good self and respected reviewers. We have incorporated all the suggested comments in the revised version of the manuscript. Please find herewith the pointwise author response to the suggested amendments.

Reviewer 1:

Dear Author

There are many mistakes in edition and writing such as (non-italic form of all bacterial species in References, C for some of temperatures, and CNS other infections, HAI' s and etc.

Authors Response: All the names of bacterial species in references are replaced with italic form. The C with degree mark has been added as well. Full from of all abbreviations have also been added in the text

Write Reference of Phage adsorption assay.

Authors Response: The suggested reference have been incorporated

Correct and rewrite Key words.

Authors Response: The revised Key words have been added in manuscript as suggested.

-Please explain the difference between data of Pus and Tracheal aspirate (Table:1) in Discussion.

Authors Response: As suggested difference between pus and Tracheal aspirates from table 1 is explained accordingly

Use other new references in discussion.

Authors Response: Few new references have been incorporated in the discussion section

More clear and determine isolated different phages.

Authors Response: The suggested changes have been incorporated.

My Decision: Major Revision

Reviewer 2:

Dear Author

This paper entitled" Occurrence of hypervirulent Klebsiella pneumoniae in clinical settings and lytic potential of bacteriophages against the isolates" . There are many topographical and editing mistakes in your paper such as:

"Patients infected with hvKp along with liver abscess can also suffer from metastasis of eye, lung, and CNS other infections" and, The degree of Celsius for incubations, Italicizing bacterial species in references.

Authors Response: Above mentioned part has been amended in the text. All bacterial species in references converted to italic form. C with degree mark has been added. Full from of al abbreviations have also been added in the revised version

Abstract: How many clinical samples have been used in this study?

Authors Response: Total 50 clinical samples were collected; it has been mentioned in abstract

Material and Methods: Please mention reference "For plaque assay, the double agar overlay method was used"

Authors Response: All the suggested references have been added in the text (Reference 32, 36)

Discussion: Use more new references and expand it.

Authors Response: As suggested, related literature has been discussed in relation to the findings of the study with appropriate references.

My final Decision: Minor revision

Reviewer 3:

1- The host range determination is unclear in the material and method part, except for the K. pneumoniae, which bacterial hosts were used?

Authors Response: As suggested the related text has been added in the relevant section

2- The statistical calculation is contradictory.

Authors Response: As suggested, All the percentages were checked accordingly

3- The isolated phages were not precisely defined.

Authors Response: This is because we did not perform the TEM analysis for the isolated phages. Basically, we were interested to find out the lytic potentials against hvKp so, we characterized the phages completely on the basis of various properties mentioned in the Materials and Methods and in results accordingly.

Reviewer 4:

ID: 120027," Occurrence of hypervirulent Klebsiella pneumoniae in clinical settings and lytic potential of bacteriophages against the isolates" Dear Author

Abstract: please correct: Change "MDR "to "MDR (Multi-Drug Resistant)"

Authors Response: The suggested change has been incorporated

Keywords: Change:" Phages; MDR, Klebsiella pneumoniae, CDC, endolysins" to" Phages; MDR, Klebsiella pneumonia"

Authors Response: Revised Keywords have been added in the revised version of manuscript

Material and method: Which standard positive microorganism has used for antimicrobial susceptibility testing.

Authors Response: Now, it has been mentioned in the text, NCBI GenBank accession No. of MF953600

Also, please write the full acronym such as "LB" and "FBS" in Material and Method

Discussion: Please discus about all parts of results.

Authors Response: Full from of all the abbreviations have been added, Additionally, discussion section has been improved in the revised version.

My final decision: minor revision

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor

Dear Author

This paper entitled" Occurrence of hypervirulent Klebsiella pneumoniae in clinical settings and lytic potential of bacteriophages against the isolates" .

There are many topographical and editing mistakes in your paper such as:

"Patients infected with hvKp along with liver abscess can also suffer from metastasis of eye, lung, and CNS other infections" and, The degree of Celsius for incubations, non-Italicizing bacterial species in references, HAI' s, and non full acronym such as" MDR", "LB" and "FBS" .

Abstract: How many clinical samples have been used in this study?

Material and Methods: Please mention reference "For plaque assay, the double agar overlay method was used "and also, reference of Phage adsorption assay?

The host range determination is unclear in the material and method part, except for the K. pneumoniae, which bacterial hosts were used? And define the isolated phages

Which standard positive microorganism has used for antimicrobial susceptibility testing?

Discussion: Please explain the difference between data of Pus and Tracheal aspirate (Table :1) in discussion and use more new references and expand it and rewrite it as well as data results.My final Decision: Major revision and etc.

Authors Response: Along with all other revision. All bacterial species in references converted to italic form. C with degree mark has been added. Full from of al abbreviations has been added. Difference between puss and Tracheal aspirates from table 1 explained. Discussion has been expanded and a new references has also been added

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) 18 Jan 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) 18 Jan 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.
Regards