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.95758
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(5); e95758

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Lmo2672 Deficiency on Environmental Adaptability, Biofilm Formation, and Motility of *Listeria monocytogenes*"

Author(s): Jie Li, Mengfan Qiao, Xingxing Zhang, Jing Li, Qingling Meng, Jun Qiao, Yan Li, Xiaoting Wang, Guowu Zhang, Kai Zhang, Lixia Wang, Xuepeng Cai

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 Jul 2019
Revised Date:	14 Apr 2020
Accepted Date:	15 Apr 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: Reviewer | Revision (0) 2 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
- The lmo 2672 is not a well abbreviated word. The authors did not write about this gene and there is no reverence about it in the whole paper.
- Objective of the study need past sentence (is-> was).
- Line 94-96: Where is Shihazi University (which country or city). line 112: its ␣ it's).
- The Material and method section is not clear and there is no reference for the whole section of material and methods.
- Data analysis could be either significant or not significant, extremely significant is a new word and needs a reference.
- Line 220 . One strain grows while the other did not grow, you can not compare these two results by P-value.
- The introduction section is too long .
- In the discussion section, there are many not relevant talk about other bacteria but there is no comparison with the Listeria monocytogenes or other Listeria Spp .
Thanks.

Alka Hasani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Well described manuscript and meticulously worked. However, all manuscripts may have some unsatisfactory features. Places highlighted require English revision and comments should be read carefully to revise and present this work in a better way.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 31 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below (Pleases find attached files). 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 reviewers' 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 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 (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.

Dear editors:

We thank you for your time as well as the reviewer's efforts and comments for our manuscript (95758) entitled "Effects of lmo2672 deficiency on the environmental adaptability, biofilm formation and motility of *Listeria monocytogenes*". Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches.

We have revised ou

The following page

Please let us know if any additional modifications are needed.

We are looking forward to your decision.

Best regards,

Sincerely,

Jun Qiao, PhD
On behalf of all authors

College of Animal Science and Technology
Shihezi University
North Street No.4, Shihezi city
Xinjiang 832003, China.
qj710625@163.com

Point-by-point responses to reviewers' comments

Comments to the Author:
Reviewer #1:

1. The lmo2672 is not a well abbreviated word. The authors did not write about this gene and there is no reference about it in the whole paper.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have described *lmo2672* gene of LM in the introduction section of manuscript.

2. Objective of the study need past sentence (is-> was).

Response: Revised as your suggestion.

3. Line 94-96: Where is Shihazi University (which country or city). line 112: its ≠ it's).

Response: The information about Shihazi University was added in manuscript as the reviewer suggested.

4. The Material and method section is not clear and there is no reference for the whole section of material and methods.

Response: According to your suggestion, we added the references in the section of material and methods.

5. Data analysis could be either significant or not significant, extremely significant is a new word needs a reference.

Response: Revised. We changed expressing way of this sentence.

6. Line 220. One strain grows while the other did not grow, you can not compare these two results by P value.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. The motility of LM-Δlmo2672 and LM

EGD-e were determined on the semi-solid plate. However, bacterial colony of LM-Δlmo2672 was significantly smaller than that of LM EGD-e.

7. The introduction section is too long.

Response: Revised according to reviewer's comments.

8. In the discussion section, there are many not relevant talk about other bacteria but there is no comparison with the Listeria monocytogenes or other Listeria Spp .

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. Revised. We have deleted those talks unrelevant to main topic and rewrite sentences in discussion section.

Reviewer 2:

Well described manuscript and meticulously worked. However, all manuscripts may have some unsatisfactory features. Places highlighted requires English revision and comments should be read carefully to revise and present this work in a better way.

Response: Thanks. As suggested by reviewers, this manuscript was revised carefully. Furthermore, the revised manuscript has been further edited by native English speaker to avoid mistakes in English writing.

1. Why chloramphenicol was used?

Response: Thanks. Because the pKSV7 plasmid that we used contains a chloramphenicol resistant gene, the positive clone of LM-Δ*lmo2672* deletion strain could be screened under the double pressure of chloramphenicol and temperature.

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)** 15 Apr 2020

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.
Thanks.