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.96646
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(4); e96646

Peer Review Report for "Detection of mcr-1 Gene in Extended-Spectrum β-Lactamase-Producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* From Human Urine Samples in Pakistan"

Author(s): Hazrat Bilal, Fareeha Hameed, Muhammad Asif Khan, Sabir Khan, Xingyuan Yang, Tayyab Ur Rehman

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 25 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 29 Mar 2020

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) — 12 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
Many thanks for the authors' submission, but by reading the manuscript, I found that
1. The results, discussion, and tables are correct but the results are poorly reported.
2. There is no innovation in method
3. It is not well discussed.
4. The discussion is just a comparison between the articles reported and does not contain innovative content
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 7 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Add OBJECTIVES of study as a separate subheading at the end of the background.
2. Table 1: add reference number for primers.

3. Results: Please add more details about demographic patients.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Mar 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 the 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 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
hanks.

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.

Reviewer 1

Comments	Authors' Response
1: The results, discussion and tables are correct but the results are poorly reported.	The results have been reported according to the methods applied for investigation in the light of EUCAST and CLSI guidelines, however, the labels for the mcr-1 harboring isolates (KP07, KP09, KP30, and KP31) have been mentioned in the manuscript. Also, this time we aim to simplify the presentation of results for ease of understanding.
2: There is no innovation in methods.	The investigation is based on standard EUCAST and CLSI guidelines as mentioned the methodology section; additionally, we did phenotypic detection of colistin-resistance applying both agar and broth microdilution method for comparative analysis.
3: It is not well discussed.	The results have been further discussed. Please check the highlighted text in the manuscript.
4: The discussion is just a comparison between the articles reported and does not contain innovative content.	In the discussion section, the comparison among the reported articles is because of epidemiological nature of our study, in which we try to compare our findings with the findings of other researchers from different geographical regions. However, we added some other points such as: • The importance of our study, where for the first time mcr-1 in urine samples in *K. pneumoniae* isolates is reported from Pakistan. • Comparative analysis of agar and broth microdilution method in response to colistin resistance. • in underdeveloped countries like Pakistan direct contact of antibiotic-resistant strains from urine samples to healthy people, resulting in direct transmission of these pathogens.

Associate Editor 1:

<table>
<tr><th>Comments</th><th>Authors' Response</th></tr>
<tr><td>1: Add OBJECTIVES of study as a separate subheading at the end of the background.</td><td>Added.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2: Table 1: add reference number for primers.</td><td>Added.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3: Results: Please add more detail about demographic patients.</td><td>Table 4: Patients demographic data, isolation source and MIC distribution of mcr-1 positive K. pneumoniae isolates.
<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Isolate ID</th><th colspan="2">Patients</th><th rowspan="2">Sample</th><th colspan="2">MIC (mg/L) of Colistin</th><th rowspan="2">Mcr-1</th></tr>
<tr><th>Gender</th><th>Age (years)</th><th>Agar dilution method</th><th>Broth micro-dilution method</th></tr>
<tr><td>KP07</td><td>Female</td><td>36</td><td>urine</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>+</td></tr>
<tr><td>KP09</td><td>Female</td><td>45</td><td>urine</td><td>4</td><td>8</td><td>+</td></tr>
<tr><td>KP30</td><td>Male</td><td>40</td><td>urine</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>+</td></tr>
<tr><td>KP31</td><td>Female</td><td>52</td><td>urine</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>+</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

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)** 29 Mar 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. Pleases follow below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html
Thanks.