Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Volume 17 · Issue 4 · e145959

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Efficacy of Crude Extract from *Streptomyces cellulosae* Against Biofilm-Related Genes of *Candida albicans*

Chiman Hamarahim Fattah, Khattab Ahmed Mustafa Shekhany, Shwan Rachid

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Feb 2024	6 Apr 2024	16 Apr 2024	10.5812/jjm-145959

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Hossein Zarrinfar, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

2 comments · 2 Mar 2024 – 4 Mar 2024

Hossein Zarrinfar Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 2 Mar 2024

Dear authors,

The manuscript has been reviewed using Track Changes. Please refer to the attached file.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 4 Mar 2024

Hello, Dear
Please correct all the points mentioned by the referees at the bottom of the page as well as in the attached file.
Reviewer 1:
Public Comment:
In the Materials and Methods section, the sentences containing "On the other hand" should be deleted.
How have the stability and release of this crude extract from Streptomyces cellulosae been evaluated?
The number of images is very large; they should be grouped into sections labeled A, B, C, etc.
The discussion part is too long to point out the limitations of the research.
In the references, the names of the journals should be abbreviated according to the journal's format.
The effective components of the crude extract were analyzed by the HPLC method.
Decision:
Major revision

Reviewer 2:
Public Comment:
Greetings and thanks to the dear authors
Please pay attention to the following.
1. The whole text should be rechecked and corrected for grammar.
2. Candida albicans should be written in full in the first line of the introduction.
3. Streptomyces cellulosae should be written in full in the third paragraph of the introduction.
4. Combine and rewrite two sentences: Mahmood et al. 2022 discovered that S. cellulosae can produce antibiofilm compounds. The extract was shown to stop Pseudomonas aeruginosa from forming biofilms [6].
5. The purpose of the review should be written in the last paragraph of the introduction and not in the discussion.
6. Concentration values should be written as numerals throughout the text. Not true: increased at three µg/mL.
7. The code of ethics should be mentioned in the relevant section.
8. Determine the positive and negative control groups in each of the tests.
Decision:
Minor revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Chief Editor,

Thank you very much for the valuable comments of the reviewers. Here are the responses point by point. Thanks for allowing us to submit a revised draft of the manuscript. We have incorporated most of the reviewers' suggestions.

Reviewer 1	**Comment**	**Answer**
	1. The whole text should be re-checked and corrected from the grammatical point of view.	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment; we have checked the whole manuscript thoroughly. Thanks again
	2. Candida albicans should be written in full in the first line of the introduction.	Dear Reviewer, sorry for that; we have corrected it (Page 2, Line 26, Yellow highlight). Thanks
	3. Streptomyces cellulosae should be written in full in the third paragraph of the introduction.	Dear Reviewer, sorry for that; we have corrected it (Page 2, Line 39, Yellow highlight). Thanks
	4. Combine and rewrite two sentences: Mahmood et al. 2022 discovered that S. cellulosae can produce antibiofilm compounds. The extract was shown to stop Pseudomonas aeruginosa from forming biofilms [6].	Dear Reviewer, sorry for that; we have corrected it (Page 2, Line 43, Yellow highlight). Thanks
	5. The purpose of the review should be stated in the last paragraph of the introduction, not in the discussion.	Dear Reviewer, sorry about that. We have removed the purpose from the discussion part. Thanks
	6. Concentration values should be written as numbers throughout the text. This is not true: it increased at three µg/mL.	Dear Reviewer, sorry for that; we have corrected it (Page 8, Line 168, Yellow highlight). Thanks
	7. The code of ethics should be mentioned in the relevant section.	Dear Reviewer, sorry for that; we have corrected it (Page 10, Line 223, Yellow highlight). Thanks
	8. Determine the positive and negative control groups in each test.	Dear Reviewer, sorry about that. We have added (Page 4, Lines 80-82, Yellow highlight). Thanks
Reviewer 2	The manuscript is reviewed as track changes. You can consider the attached file.	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comments. We have corrected the manuscript based on your comments and merged it with the final corrected version. Thanks again
Reviewer 3	The sentence "On the other hand" should be deleted from the material and method section.	Dear Reviewer, sorry for that; we have removed it. Thanks
	How has the stability and release of this crude extract from Streptomyces cellulose been evaluated?	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment. To evaluate the stability of the crude extract, we conducted an experiment where the extract was boiled for 15 minutes and then tested for its impact on *Candida* biofilm. The findings indicated no effect, suggesting that boiling led to the loss of bioactivity in the crude extract.
	The number of images is vast; it should be sections A, B, C, etc.	Dear Reviewer, thank you for the comment. The number of images has been arranged into 3. Thanks again
	The discussion part should be shorter to point out the limitations of the research.	Dear Reviewer, thank you for the comment. The discussion part has been reduced to 2 pages. Thanks again
	In the references, the names of the journals	Dear Reviewer, thank you for the comment.

	should be given in short and summarized form and adjusted according to the journal's format.	All the references are unified, and the journal names have been written in short and summarized form and adjusted according to the journal's format. Thanks again
	The practical components of the crude extract were analyzed using the HPLC method.	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment, and sorry for that; Presently, our focus is solely on the crude extract, therefore we regret not conducting HPLC analyses at this time.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.