Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Volume 17 · Issue 8 · e147563

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Diffusely Adherent and Cyclomodulin-Positive *Escherichia coli* Are Associated with Colon Diseases

Seyed Abolfazl Hosseininasab, Fereshteh Saffari, Omid Tadjrobehkar, Hengameh Zandi, Bizhan Ahmadi, Asghar Khoshnood, Naser Niksefat, Mahtab Mehboodi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
7 Apr 2024	5 Aug 2024	6 Aug 2024	10.5812/jjm-147563

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** Referee 1 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

1 comment · 26 Jun 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 26 Jun 2024

Dear editor

The manuscript entitled “Diffusely adherent and cyclomodulin- positive Escherichia coli are associated with colon diseases;” is an interesting article about the relationship between E. coli pathogenicity genes and colon diseases. The research has an interesting idea, but in general, drawing conclusions in such research is a difficult task and should be done with caution.
On the whole, the manuscript is well written, but there are some minor points:
In the abstract, it is better to write the numbers and percentages of genes in the results section.
The table and figures are well prepared, but the results are written ambiguously, and it is better to clarify this part by specifying the numbers.
Determining the phylotype of samples is one of the advantages of this research, but it is better to explain in the discussion why some samples were not typed with the technique used.
The limitations of the research are well mentioned in the discussion section, and on this basis, it is better to talk more carefully about the relationship of afa-C+ DAEC with colon diseases in the conclusion section.

Regards

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 Editor

Thanks for valuable comments of you and Reviewers, the comments were applied as follows:

Reviewer`s comment #1
Public Comment:
1.Abstract is not structural. Format of abstract was improved. Now, it includes background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions.

2. Key words: generally, abbreviations do not make good keywords, because a given abbreviation or acronym may be used for different terms depending on the domain. Also stool is not a key word, perhaps fecal flora is a better substitute. The keywords were modified.

3. Line 53 to57 needs a reference. Reference (#6) was added.

4. In Table 1. either positive or negative cases should be presented, not both of them. Negative items were removed.

5. Also instead of colon disease in the title of tables write inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) and , colorectal cancer (CRC); control: healthy subjects, and you do not need to write the abbreviation below the tables.. Since there are many types of colon disease not the only two types that you worked out. The title of tables were modified.

6. There are three charts in figure 1, I think you can collect them in one chart instead of three. You can easily label each of them. The three charts were summarized in one figure.

7. I think there are several articles from Kerman in regard to E.coli phylo-typing, biofilm formation and detection of genes involved in pathogenicity, it is a good idea to refer to at least one of them for comparing your work with the works performed earlier. Two references (#22, #24) were added and discussed in discussion section.

8. Also please add a more resent article dated in 2023 or 2024. One article that was published in 2024 (#27) was added.

Reviewer`s comments #2
Public Comment:
Dear editor
The manuscript entitled “Diffusely adherent and cyclomodulin- positive Escherichia coli are associated with colon diseases;” is an interesting article about the relationship between E. coli pathogenicity genes and colon diseases. The research has an interesting idea, but in general, drawing conclusions in such researches is a difficult task and should be done with caution.
On the whole the manuscript is well written but there are some minor points:

1. In abstract, it is better to write numbers and percentages of genes in the results section. Numbers and percentages of genes were added.

2. The table and figures are well prepared, but the results are written ambiguously, and it is better to clarify this part by specifying the numbers. It was tried to be improved. This was done both in results sections and discussion sections and was highlighted.

3. Determining the phylotype of samples is one of the advantages of this research, but it is better to explain in the discussion why some samples were not typed with the technique used. It was applied in the results and discussion sections and was discussed in the first paragraph of discussion section.

4. The limitations of the research are well mentioned in the discussion section, and on this basis, it is better to talk more carefully about the relationship of afa-C+ DAEC with colon diseases in the conclusion section. Right. Due to limitations of the study, conclusion should be made with caution. This issue was emphasized again in the conclusion.

AE comments:
In the materials and methods section, there is a need for more explanation about the method of sampling and culture of stool samples as well as the identification of isolates. For example, in which laboratory were the tests and examinations done? Also, the name of the biochemical tests to identify the isolates and the characteristics of the selected colonies be mentioned. These subjects were mentioned in the materials and methods section.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.