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-120079
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 15(2); e120079

Peer Review Report for "Genetic Cassettes Profiling of Class I Integron and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profiles Among *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Isolates Collected from Patients in North of Iran"

Author(s): Reyhane Ebrahimi-Shahabi, Elaheh Ferdosi-Shahandashti, Parisa Sabbagh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Oct 2021
Revised Date: 7 Mar 2022
Accepted Date: 4 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: EIC | **Revision (0)** 15 Oct 2021

Dear Authors,
I would like to thank you very much for submitting your manuscript to us for consideration. We cannot enter your manuscript in the review process, due to a lack of several points. Please revise the manuscript based on the attached JJM instruction and resubmit a clean version.
Please add ethics and approval codes by your University. Moreover, who supported this project? Add approved code number.
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.

Revision letter

Dear Editorial team

At first, we thank you for allowing our paper to review. After an exact revision, it is available now. The edited version of our manuscript has been resubmitted as a highlighted version to your journal. All performed revisions are listed below.

As following comments in Minor revision:

1- Some words were changed to reduce the percentage of plagiarism and marked with a yellow highlight.

2- About ethics and approval codes by University: This project has been done along with my research projects, so it has been done at personal expense, and since the existing samples were used, there was no need to receive a code of ethics.

3- Two sections were added to the end, which were marked with green highlights.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 2 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks to authors for good practical research.
Kindly, the following should be considered by authors:
1. English editing is the first important problem to improve article quality (ambiguous sentences, grammatical errors, microbiology terms).
2. Statistical analysis isn't clear. Please analysis in each groups and the between groups.
3. Please refer to CLSI (2020, M100,30th ed) page 80.
There are some mistakes in choosing antibiotics. Trimethoprim, ampicillin, cefotaxime and nitrofurantoin aren't in the table 2B-1
4. Its very clear that we take these results about ampicillin and nitrofurantoin.
5. In table design please choose one of the words "susceptibility or resistance"
6. In table 2 and 3 percent value is not correct.
7. Please explain the results of agar dilution method.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 Feb 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 11 Feb 2022

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, please 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.

Revision letter

Dear Editorial team

At first, we thank you for allowing our paper to review. After an exact revision, it is available now. The edited version of our manuscript has been resubmitted as a highlighted version to your journal. All performed revisions are listed below. As following comments in Major revision:

Reviewer 1:

Q1: English editing is the first important problem to improve article quality
R1: English editing is done

Q2: Statistical analysis is not clear. Please analysis in each groups and the between groups.
R2: Bacterial isolates were isolated from samples collected in the hospital laboratory and information about each ward could not be traced. Therefore, the method is edited and written in general

Q3: Please refer to CLSI (2020,M100,30th ed) page 80.
R3: Refer to CLSI 2020 is done

Q4: It is very clear that we take these results about ampicillin and nitrofurantoin
R4: About the choice of ampicillin, cefotaxime, trimethoprim, nitrofurantoin was based on the routine antibiotics prescribed to patients on that time, which were examined in conjunction with the antibiotics in the CLSI. However if the reviewer intends to remove these items, we will be applied.

Q5: In table design please choose one of the words "susceptibility or resistance"
R5: Done

Q6: In table 2 and 3 percent value is note correct
R6: Done

Q7: Please explain the results of agar dilution method.
R7: The Information of ADM is given in the results section and table 3.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Abstract

Q: Add “Objectives” of study in separate subheading:

R: DONE

Background

Q: “gram-negative” change “Gram-negative”*:*

R: DONE

Q: “Recently, another class of mobile DNA elements” needs a suitable reference.

R: Because the reference was not found and this sentence does not have much effect on comprehension, it was decided to delete this sentence.

Q: Add “Objectives” of the study in a separate subheading at the end of the introduction section:

R: DONE

Methods

Q: Add full name ICU

R: As stated in the answer to the third question of the first reveiwer, due to the lack of information about the people, different sections were deleted and written in general, so there is no need to write the full name of ICU.

Q: How many Pseudomonas aeruginosa were sequenced. Add accession numbers.

R: Randomly, 10 samples were sequenced, and only two strains having new sequences, which were written in the article with the accession numbers.

Q: P.seudomonas ATCC 27853

R: Pseudomonas aeruginosa ATCC 27853 was isolated from a hospital blood specimen in 1971 and has been widely used as a model strain to survey antibiotics susceptibilities, biofilm development, and metabolic activities of Pseudomonas spp.

Results

Q: Add full name MDR

R: DONE

Discussion

Q: “gram-negative” change “Gram-negative”

R: DONE

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) 4 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** (2) 4 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.