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.98852
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(3); e98852

Peer Review Report for "Staphylococcal Cassette Chromosome mec Typing of Meticillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Kermanshah Province, West of Iran"

Author(s): Yahyah Hesari, Nasrollah Sohrabi, Ramin Abiri, Sajjad Babaei, Zohreh Amiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	12 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	13 Mar 2020
Accepted Date:	16 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.

Abbas Farahani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

21 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The present study authors find drug susceptibility patterns and Staphylococcal Cassette Chromosome mec typing of MRSA strains in Kermanshah Province, West of Iran. Although the topic is of interest for the Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology, the manuscript and study has some serious flaws.
- The manuscript could have provided more descriptive information on the isolates (colonization vs infection), outbreaks during sampling period, infection measure controls...etc. The discussion goes into too much detail to compare findings with other studies that the message the authors are trying to convey got lost to me.
- The manuscript, however, has extensive grammatical errors, that could be fixed by consultation with an editor. As a result of such errors, there are frequent paragraphs where it is not clear what the authors are trying to say.
- MDR: preferably give definitions in methodology.
- In the Material and Methods section-Paragraph “Statistical analysis”- It is not clear on which data the kind of statistical analysis has been applied, please specify and add in end of material and methods.

- Methods, Identification of S. aureus isolates section: do not report results under methodology.
- The prevalence of HA-MRSA (types I, II, and III) is 74.69% or 84.7%?
- Start discussion by presenting your main findings
- What is the limitation of the study?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 26 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript has focused on the investigation of antibiotic susceptibility pattern and SCCmec typing of MRSA isolates in Kermanshah province, west of Iran
The research topic is some novelty and some interest. But, there are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Language check is recommended.
- The units of measurement used in the whole manuscript would be unified.
- Please refer to other literature and revise the introduction to give a concrete background of this study.
- Please provide a reference for "Definition of multiple drug resistance".
- Please provide a reference for "Determination of minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) by agar dilution".
- Please provide a reference for "The phenotypic identification of S. aureus isolates"
- In the section of "Antimicrobial susceptibility testing", Methicillin is not used, why?
- The discussion needs a lot more information about "Results of cefoxitin disk diffusion susceptibility test and PCR analysis"
Thanks.

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

Dear AE,
The manuscript has some grammatical errors and should be corrected.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

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 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.

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.

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 Professor Ali Zarei Mahmoudabadi,

Editor-in-Chief of Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have revised the manuscript according to reviewer's comments. Please find point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns.

- Grammatical error were corrected and showed in red colored letters.

- We addressed reviewer's comments in yellow colored letters in revised version of manuscript, as detailed below:

1- According to our information all samples were obtained from approved infection cases.
2- The definition for MDR was added in methodology.
3- Statistical analysis was specified in text.
4- The prevalence of HA-MRSA (types I, II, and III) is 74.7% that it was corrected.
5- Limitation of study was mentioned in the end of discussion.
6- The units of measurement were unified in the manuscript.
7- We revised the introduction of manuscript and we added more details in this part (ref: 4-7)
8- We provided references for "Definition of multiple drug resistance''(ref: 15), ''Determination of minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) by agar dilution'' (ref: 8) and ''The phenotypic identification of S. aureus isolates'' (ref: 13).
9- We added more information about "Results of cefoxitin disk diffusion susceptibility test and PCR analysis'' in discussion (ref:21,22).
10- According CLSI guidelines and also a lot of studies cefoxitin disk diffusion test as an alternative phenotypic method for detection of MRSA isolates is more reliable than those with oxacillin.

With best regards,

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