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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.84174
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 12(11); e84174

Peer Review Report for "The Prevalence of Atypical Pneumonia Caused by *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* (P1 gene) in Patients with Respiratory Infections by Culture and Molecular PCR Methods in Tehran, Iran"

Author(s): Zahra Babaei, Iman Pouladi, Abbass Ashtari, Gasem Azimi, Mohammad Niakan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Sep 2018
Revised Date: 10 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 11 Dec 2019

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)

4 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
"Evaluation of Atypical Pneumonia caused by Mycoplasma Pneumoniae (P1 Gene) with two methods of culture and molecular PCR in Tehran, Iran."
Comments for the authors:
Abstract section:
1. genome cultivation written in the abstract is wrong.
2. Material and method section is not clear, what test was used to identify M. pneumoniae from other mycoplasma in the culture method. Also, what were the authors purpose for writing mycoplasma kind
3. In result section 27 case from 102 sample is not 47.26%,
4. In the conclusion section, the major cause of atypical Pneumonia was reported to be M. Pneumoniae (13.6%)which was taken from PCR results, they did not talk about the superiority of PCR over culture.
Introduction section
1. Antigen surface is not correct, maybe they meant surface antigen.

2. The English grammar needs a real revision. In some sections the sentence is started with low case letter and in some case in the middle of the sentence you can see the uppercase letters.

Material and method section

1. What were the criteria for including or excluding a patient from the study? For example, they take the sample even if she/he used the antimicrobial agents recently.
2. The author writes that the environment was placed .....do they mean the medium?
3. There is no reference for the methods used in the study.
4. Was the PCR test performed by a kit? If yes they should name the provider, and if not they should give a reference.
5. In section 3-5 I cannot understand the word the meaning of the word sex in the sentence (16Sr RNA gene).

Result section

Is very short. And are not result section 4.1 is about patients so it can be considered as material and method section, not result.

Discussion section

There is no real discussion. The authors did not compare the result of culture with PCR. They did not have any information regarding the sensitivity and specificity of these tests. There is no analysis of data in the paper.

References

1. I could not find the ref no 1 in the pub med, I did not check the other references.
2. Many references like No 6,7,8,15,25 and 27 are completely irrelevant to the manuscript

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 17 Feb 2019

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 21 Feb 2019

Dear authors

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. Please answer point by point to 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. 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.

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition JJM INSTRUCTION attached to mail, Pleases find it.

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.

Greetings and Regards.

The answer of the respectable judges, Which is basically answered.

Abstract section:

1. genome cultivation written in the abstract is wrong.

R. Completely modified. genome extraction

2. Material and method section is not clear, what test was used to identify M. pneumoniae from other mycoplasma in the culture method. Also, what were the authors purpose for writing mycoplasma kind.

R. The Material and method section is completely reviewed. Use of the culture medium most used for Mycoplasma pneumoniae

3. In result section 27 case from 102 sample is not 47.26%

R. Completely modified,%26.47

4. In the conclusion section, the major cause of atypical Pneumonia was reported to be M. Pneumoniae (13.6%)which was taken from PCR results, they did not talk about the superiority of PCR over culture.

R. The discussion section was completely modified. And fully discussed the superiority of the molecular method to the culture method.

Introduction section.

1. Antigen surface is not correct, maybe they meant surface antigen.

R. Completely modified surface antigen

2. The English grammar needs a real revision. In some sections the sentence is started with low case letter and in some case in the middle of the sentence you can see the uppercase letters.

R. The grammar was completely corrected.

Material and method section.

1. What were the criteria for including or excluding a patient for the study? For example, they take the sample even if she/he used the antimicrobial agents recently.

R. Modified, and the necessary criteria were added to the method section

2. The author writes that the environment was placed …..do they mean the medium?

R. Completely modified And culture medium was used.

3. There is no reference for the methods used in the study.

R. This section has been completely modified. And also the reference for this section has been added.

4. Was the PCR test performed by a kit? If yes they should name the provider, and if not they should give a reference.

R. In this study, phenol-chloroform method was used for DNA extraction.

5. In section 3-5 I cannot understand the word the meaning of the word sex in the sentence (16Sr RNA gene).

R. This section of the genus is bacterial,Which has been completely modified

Result section

Is very short. And are not result section 4.1 is about patients so it can be considered as material and method section, not result.

R. The results were expanded and modified

Discussion section

There is no real discussion. The authors did not compare the result of culture with PCR. They did not have any information regarding the sensitivity and specificity of these tests. There is no analysis of data in the paper.

R. The results of cultivation with the molecular results were discussed and compared.As well as their sensitivity and specificity were discussed.

References.

1. I could not find the ref no 1 in the pub med, I did not check the other references.

R. Reference number 1 is in the pubmed environment

2. Many references like No 6,7,8,15,25 and 27 are completely irrelevant to the manuscript

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) 27 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- In the results, "From 102 samples of patients, 27 samples (%26.47) afflicted with Mycoplasma pneumonia were isolated in PPLO Agar medium. Using specific primers, it was found that 33 samples (%32.4) were positive in terms of mycoplasma genus and 14 samples (%13.7) were positive for the presence of mycoplasma"
- In culture, you detected 27 Mycoplasma pneumoniae and in PCR 14 samples (%13.7) were positive for the presence of mycoplasma,
1. Based on the results, are your conclusions correct? Does PCR have high sensitivity for detection? Which spp of mycoplasma detected by PCR (ACCORDING TO ABSTRACT RESULTS).
- For the determination of sensitivity and specificity of phenotypic methods such as compared with PCR you most use statistic analysis such as medCalc 81, available online (https://www.medcalc.org/calc/diagnostic_test.php).
Regards

Shahla Mansouri: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 2 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
- Many parts are corrected in the abstract section.
- The difference between the mycoplasma genus and mycoplasma is not clarified, maybe the first or second one is M.pneumoniae.
- None of the irrelevant references in the manuscript are changed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 2 Dec 2019

Dear authors
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. 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. 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.

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. In addition, JJM INSTRUCTION attached to the mail, Pleases find it.

Note:

Please add 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. http://single.demo.pub/en/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.

Respond one by one to the opinions of esteemed reviewers.

All items are displayed after correction as color change within the article text.

1. In the Results section of the abstract.

The 27 samples grown on PPLO agar medium were changed from Mycoplasma pneumoniae to Mycoplasma and expressed as follows:

- In this study, 27 (%26.47) colonies of Mycoplasma were isolated on PPLO agar medium.

- Using specific primers, it was found that 33 samples (%32.4) were positive in terms of Mycoplasma genus and 14 samples (%13.7) were positive for the presence of Mycoplasma pneumoniae.

2. In the Results section.

Using the online software medCalc 81, the specificity and specificity of the molecular method relative to the phenotypic method of culture have been indicated.

- Also, sensitivity (66.67٪) and specificity (94.74%) were reported for the molecular-PCR technique based on the analysis performed by the online statistical system medCalc 81.

3. Similarity Report:

- A copy of the article had already been mistakenly sent to the magazine, which was again deleted by the authors the same day. And now the original version is an article with code 84174.

4. References section

All references in the PubMed environment were checked and refined by Vancouver-based Endnotes software, and some references are [Persian].

References

1. Ke LQ, Wang FM, Li YJ, Luo YC. [Epidemiological characteristics of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* pneumonia in children]. Zhongguo Dang Dai Er Ke Za Zhi. 2013 Jan;15(1):33-6.
2. He XY, Wang XB, Zhang R, Yuan ZJ, Tan JJ, Peng B, et al. Investigation of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* infection in pediatric population from 12,025 cases with respiratory infection. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis. 2013 Jan;75(1):22-7.
3. Dash S, Chaudhry R, Dhawan B, Dey AB, Kabra SK, Das BK. Clinical spectrum and diagnostic yields of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* as a causative agent of community-acquired pneumonia. J Lab Physicians. 2018 Jan-Mar;10(1):44-49.
4. Saraya T. *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* infection: Basics. J Gen Fam Med. 2017 Apr 17;18(3):118-125.
5. Meyer Sauteur PM, Unger WW, Nadal D, Berger C, Vink C, van Rossum AM. Infection with and Carriage of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* in Children. Front Microbiol. 2016 Mar 23;7:329.
6. Page CA, Krause DC. Protein kinase/phosphatase function correlates with gliding motility in *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*. J Bacteriol. 2013 Apr;195(8):1750-7.
7. Schmidl SR, Otto A, Lluch-Senar M, Piñol J, Busse J, Becher D, Stülke J. A trigger enzyme in *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*: impact of the glycerophosphodiesterase GlpQ on virulence and gene expression. PLoS Pathog. 2011 Sep;7(9):e1002263.
8. Xiao L, Ptacek T, Osborne JD, Crabb DM, Simmons WL, Lefkowitz EJ, et al. Comparative genome analysis of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*. BMC Genomics. 2015 Aug 16;16:610.
9. Duffy MF, Whithear KG, Noormohammadi AH, Markham PF, Catton M, Leydon J, Browning GF. Indirect enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for detection of immunoglobulin G reactive with a recombinant protein expressed from the gene encoding the 116-kilodalton protein of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*. J Clin Microbiol.1999 Apr;37(4):1024-9.
10. Shimizu T. Inflammation-inducing Factors of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*. Front Microbiol. 2016 Mar 31;7:414.

11. Kazama I, Nakajima T. Dual infection of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* and Chlamydophila pneumoniae in patients with atopic predispositions successfully treated by moxifloxacin. Infez Med. 2014 Mar;22(1):41-7.

12. Wang ZH, Li XM, Wang YS, Guo ZY. Changes in the Levels of Interleukin-17 Between Atopic and Non-atopic Children with *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* Pneumonia. Inflammation. 2016 Dec;39(6):1871-1875.

13. Wang L, Feng Z, Zhao M, Yang S, Yan X, Guo W, et al. A comparison study between GeXP-based multiplex-PCR and serology assay for *Mycoplasma pneumonia* detection in children with community acquired pneumonia. BMC Infect Dis. 2017 Jul 25;17(1):518.

14. Xu W, Guo L, Dong X, Li X, Zhou P, Ni Q, et al. Detection of Viruses and *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* in Hospitalized Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Infection in Northern China, 2015-2016. Jpn J Infect Dis. 2018 Mar 22;71(2):134-139.

15. Kim JH, Cho TS, Moon JH, Kim CR, Oh JW. Serial Changes in Serum Eosinophil-associated Mediators between Atopic and Non-atopic Children after Mycoplasma pneumoniae pneumonia. Allergy Asthma Immunol Res. 2014 Sep;6(5):428-33.

16. Yu Y, Fei A. Atypical pathogen infection in community-acquired pneumonia. Biosci Trends. 2016 Feb;10(1):7-13.

17. Youn YS, Lee SC, Rhim JW, Shin MS, Kang JH, Lee KY. Early Additional Immune-Modulators for *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* Pneumonia in Children: An Observation Study. Infect Chemother. 2014 Dec;46(4):239-47.

18. Cillóniz C, Torres A, Niederman M, van der Eerden M, Chalmers J, Welte T, et al.Community-acquired pneumonia related to intracellular pathogens. Intensive Care Med. 2016 Sep;42(9):1374-86.

19. Sharma L,Losier A,Tolbert T,Dela Cruz CS,Morison CR . Atypical Pneumonia: Updates on Legionella, Chlamydophila, and *Mycoplasma Pneumoniae*. Clin Chest Med, 2017;38(1):45-58.

20. Carrim M, Wolter N, Benitez AJ, Tempia S, du Plessis M, Walaza S, et al. Epidemiology and Molecular Identification and Characterization of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, South Africa, 2012-2015. Emerg Infect Dis. 2018 Mar;24(3):506-513.

21. Maheshwari M, Kumar S, Sethi GR, Bhalla P. Detection of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* in children with lower respiratory tract infections. Trop Doct. 2011 Jan;41(1):40-2.

22. Al-Ghizawi GJ, Al-Sulami AA, Al-Taher SS. Profile of community- and hospital-acquired pneumonia cases admitted to Basra General Hospital, Iraq. East Mediterr Health J. 2007 Mar-Apr;13(2):230-42.

23. Golmohammadi R, Ataee R A, Alishiri G H, Mirnejad R, Najafi A, Tate M, et al . Molecular Diagnosis of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* in Synovial Fluid of Rheumatoid Arthritis Patients. Iran J Med Microbiol. 2014;8(1):1-8.[Persian]

24. Wijesooriya LI, Kok T, Perera J, Tilakarathne Y, Sunil-Chandra NP. *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* DNA detection and specific antibody class response in patients from two tertiary care hospitals in tropical Sri Lanka. J Med Microbiol. 2018 Sep;67(9):1232-1242.

25. Schelonka RL, Waites KB. Ureaplasma infection and neonatal lung disease. Semin Perinatol. 2007 Feb;31(1):2-9.

26. Shahhosseiny M, Mardani M, Hosseini Z, Khorm Khorshid HR, Rahimi AA, Wand Yousefi J. Comparison of culture and CPC tests for diagnose respiratory infections of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*. Journal of Zanjan University.2006 ;14(56):12-23. [Persian]

27. Wu PS, Chang LY, Lin HC, Chi H, Hsieh YC, Huang YC, et al. Epidemiology and clinical manifestations of children with macrolide-resistant *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* pneumonia in Taiwan. Pediatr Pulmonol. 2013 Sep;48(9):904-11.

28. Reinton N, Manley L, Tjade T, Moghaddam A. Respiratory tract infections during the 2011 *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* epidemic. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2013 Jun;32(6):835-40.

29. Medjo B, Atanaskovic-Markovic M, Radic S, Nikolic D, Lukac M, Djukic S. *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* as a causative agent of community-acquired pneumonia in children: clinical features and laboratory diagnosis. Ital J Pediatr. 2014 Dec 18;40:104.

30. Chaudhry R, Valavane A, Sreenath K, Choudhary M, Sagar T, Shende T, et al. Detection of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* and Legionella pneumophila in Patients Having Community-Acquired Pneumonia: A Multicentric Study from New Delhi, India. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2017 Dec;97(6):1710-1716.

31. Talkington DF, Thacker WL, Keller DW, Jensen JS. Diagnosis of *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* infection in autopsy and open-lung biopsy tissues by nested PCR. J Clin Microbiol. 1998 Apr;36(4):1151-3.

32. Sharifi S, Ghottaslo R, Akhi MT, Soroush MH, Ansarin Kh, Shabanpour J..Identification of respiratory infections caused by *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* With three methods of cultivation, ELISA and PCR. Medical journal of Tabriz University. 2011;23(3):36-41. [Persian]

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 11 Dec 2019

Dear authors
According to the associated editor report, your manuscript is accepted for publishing in JJM and send to the publisher for the next process.
Note:
Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Pleases follow below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.