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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.90902
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 12(11); e90902

Peer Review Report for "The First Report of Prevalence of Class 1-3 Integrons in Clinical Isolates of *Staphylococcus aureus* in Southwestern Iran: A Multicenter Study"

Author(s): Seyed Mohsen Hosseini, Nahal Hadi, Abdollah Bazargani, Amir Emami, Neda Pirbonyeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Feb 2019
Revised Date: 19 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Jan 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Shahla Mansouri: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
- Abstract section:
There is no statistical presentation in the abstract section. In the conclusion presence of integrons was said to be statistically associated with antibacterial resistance. This section is not correct and I checked the Table 3 forTe and Ra in this respect and I strongly believe that they make a mistake in their conclusion and there is no difference in this respect.
- Material and method section:
Section 3.1. There is no reference in this section they did not even mention which molecular method they used, and which gene or genes were identified.
Section 3.2. According to CLSI guide lines incubation temperature is 35Cº and not 37 Cº.
- Table 1
Table is not correctly presented. Antibiotic is written on the top of the column for

MRSA….and not above the antibacterial agents. The legend is not also correct. They did not separate MRSA from MSSA.

- Table 2

Different samples from infected sources is correct.

- Table3

As I mentioned earlier in this table the % positive in the groups are nearly similar and numbers are different, but it seems that they compare the numbers ,and did not consider the total number in that group. This table should be changed and the results and discussion should be changed by the new results for the manuscript to be considered for publications. Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 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 is attached to the mail, Please find it.

Note:

Please add the ORCID number to you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Please follow the below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html

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.

Editor in Chief

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Dear, Prof. Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi,

Many thanks for your e-mail regarding our submitted manuscript ID 90902. Also, great thanks for the reviewers' comments and their helps. Our point to point responses to the reviewers and the revised manuscript which is highlighted in revised parts are attached. I hope this could be enough to cover all the comments. Anyway, I would be grateful if you let us know about any further changes required.

Sincerely yours,

Reviewer No. 1:

1. Comment(C): In abstract, there is no statistical presentation in the abstract section.

Response (R): The statistical presentation was added to the abstract section

2.C: In the conclusion of abstract, presence of integrons was said to be statistically associated with antibacterial resistance. This section is not correct and I checked the Table 3 forTe and Ra in this respect and I strongly believe that they make a mistake in their conclusion and there is no difference in this respect.

R: With respect to the reviewer comment, the conclusion of abstract was changed.

3. C: In section 3.1 in material and method, there is no reference in this section they did not even mention which molecular method they used, and which gene or genes were identified.

R: Reference was added to the molecular method used and the type of molecular method and the name of the gene used were expressed. In this respect, section 3.4(Identification of *S. aureus*) was added. Sections number were also changed.

4. C: In section 3.1 in material and method, According to CLSI guide lines incubation temperature is 35Cº and not 37 Cº.

R: Thank you. Mentioned mistake was corrected.

5.C: Table 1, Table is not correctly presented. Antibiotic is written on the top of the column for MRSA….and not above the antibacterial agents. The legend is not also correct. They did not separate MRSA from MSSA.

R: Thanks for your attention. The table was modified based on the comments provided and the legends were corrected.

6. C: Table 2, Different samples from infected sources is correct.

R: Thank you. Mentioned mistake was corrected.

7. C: Table 3, As I mentioned earlier in this table the % positive in the groups are nearly similar and numbers are different, but it seems that they compare the numbers, and did not consider the total number in that group. This

table should be changed and the results and discussion should be changed by the new results for the manuscript to be considered for publications.

R: With respect to the reviewer comment, the table was changed and results and discussion were revised.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 23 Jan 2020

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