Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Volume 17 · Issue 11 · e154546

OPEN PEER REVIEW

miR-26a and miR-125b as Indicators for the Severity of SARS-CoV-2 Infectious: A Case-Control Study

Milad Jaberi, Milad Asadi, Habib Zarredar, Dariush Shanehbandi, Venus Zafari, Ahmad Pouresmaeil, Akbar Sharifi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
11 Sep 2024	11 Nov 2024	20 Nov 2024	10.5812/jjm-154546

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 7

1 Original submission

1 comment · 6 Oct 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 6 Oct 2024

Dear Editor,
In this study, the authors evaluated two micro RNAs, including 26a and 125b, as biomarkers in patients with COVID-19 infection. The manuscript needs some corrections for language errors, but in my opinion, it has some problems, especially in the methodology.
1- In the method section, the authors defined poor and good prognosis. What are the inclusion criteria for each group? Please specify these in detail.
2- Why did the authors not use a healthy control group? The readers have no information about mir expression levels in healthy people.
3- In the result section, please mention only the results. Some parts of the result section repeat the method and statistical analysis section.
4- Please correct "PMBC" in the result section.
5- In the discussion section, please use more related studies about mir 26 a and mir 125b. The authors provided very little discussion of their results or comparison with other studies in this section.

Overall, in my view, the main problem in this study is the absence of a healthy control group, which should be considered.

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.

Thank you for your detailed evaluation and the opportunity to revise our manuscript titled " miR-26a and miR-125b as indicators for the severity of SARS-coV-2 infectious: A Case-Control Study." We highly appreciate the reviewers' constructive comments and suggestions.

We will thoroughly address each point raised by the Editor(s) and Reviewers and will submit a revised version of the manuscript, including a separate response file detailing our revisions item by item. We will also ensure that all changes are highlighted in yellow, as requested.

Best Regards,

Reviewer Comment 1: In the method section, the authors defined poor and good prognosis. What are the inclusion criteria for each group? Please mention exactly in detail.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have revised the methodology section to clarify the inclusion criteria for each group. Patients classified with a "poor prognosis" presented severe lung damage, reduced blood oxygen levels, and required intensive care. In contrast, the "good prognosis" group included patients with mild symptoms and no significant lung involvement. These criteria are now detailed in the "Methods" section.

Reviewer Comment 2: Why did the authors not use a healthy control group? The readers have no idea about miRNA expression levels in healthy people.

Response: We appreciate this suggestion. The primary focus of our study was to compare miR-26a and miR-125b levels in COVID-19 patients with different severities rather than establishing baseline miRNA levels. However, we agree that including healthy controls would provide valuable context, and we intend to address this in future studies to offer more comprehensive insights.

Reviewer Comment 3: In the results section, please only mention the results. Some parts of the results section are a repeat of the methods and statistical analysis sections.

Response: Thank you for this observation. We have revised the results section to focus solely on the findings, eliminating any redundant information about methods and statistical analysis.

Reviewer Comment 4: Please correct "PMBC" in the results section.

Response: We have corrected "PMBC" to "PBMC" throughout the results section and the manuscript.

Reviewer Comment 5: In the discussion section, please use more related studies about miR-26a and miR-125b. The authors very little discussed their results and compared them to other studies in this section.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have expanded the discussion section to include additional studies and comparisons related to miR-26a and miR-125b's role in inflammation and viral infections, enhancing the context and relevance of our findings.

Reviewer Comment 6: Why is the sequencing technique mentioned in the abstract but not in the material and methods?

Response: We apologize for the inconsistency. We have changed it to extracting.

Reviewer Comment 7: Please write the name of the company and the country of the manufacturer of the RNA extraction kit.

Response: We have included the name of the RNA extraction kit's manufacturer, Exiqon (Denmark), in the "Materials and Methods" section to provide full transparency.

Response to AI Recommendations

1- Clarify the study design in the title and abstract.

Response: We have revised both the title and abstract to clearly convey that this is a case-control study focusing on miR-26a and miR-125b as biomarkers for COVID-19 severity.

2-Provide detailed statistical methods and analyses.

Response: thank you so much. It has done.

3- Discuss potential biases and limitations more thoroughly.

Response: We appreciate this recommendation. It has done.

4- Include funding sources and any conflicts of interest.

Response: We have added a these section.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.