Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 24 · Issue 4 · e114238

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Potency of Tedizolid, Linezolid, and Vancomycin Against Extensively Drug-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Clinical Isolates

Leila Fozouni, Zahra Pishdad, Sara Malekpour Kolbadinezhad

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
7 Mar 2021	22 Oct 2021	7 Nov 2021	10.5812/zjrms-114238

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Haider Abdul-Lateef Mousa, Farzaneh Farajian-Mashhadi 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8
4 **Revision 3** 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11
5 **Revision 4** 12
Authors' reply to reviewers 13
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

2 comments · 19 Mar 2021 – 14 Aug 2021

Haider Abdul-Lateef Mousa Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 Mar 2021

Title: The title should be modified to include “in clinical isolates”: The Potency of Tedizolid, Linezolid, and Vancomycin against Extensively Drug-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus in Clinical Isolates.
Methods
There is no information about the source of samples from the control group. More details are required about the control group. What is the justification for sampling from the healthy control group?
Results
An additional table is required about the infections from which the sample was obtained.

Farzaneh Farajian-Mashhadi Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 14 Aug 2021

There are some complexities in your method:
In the present study, it should be determined whether there was a control group for all samples, e.g., wounds, or only for samples from nasal and skin regions, which could have healthy carriers.
In my opinion, considering hospital staff who are nasal carriers of S. aureus in the neonatal ward as controls and comparing their nasal flora with that of newborn children would not be a rational comparison.
In lines 197 and 198: “In the present research, patients (13.8%) and control (3.2%) individuals were shown resistance to daptomycin”. But your research was not about this antibiotic.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Replying to Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

There are some complexity in your method:

In the present study it should be determined if there was control group for all samples e.g. wounds: or only samples from nasal and skin regions which could have healthy carrier.

In my opinion, the hospital staff as the nasal carriers of S. aureus in neonatal ward considering as control and comparing to newborn child nasal flora; could not be a rational comparison.

Nasal area and Skin were considered as control group.

In lines 197 and 198 : “In the present research, patients (13.8%) and control (3.2%) individuals were shown resistance to daptomycin” But your research was not about this antibiotic.

Please see Table1.

Reviewer 2:

Please have the statistics section of the article checked by a statistics specialist; for example, see the following problems:

The independent t-test is used for quantitative numbers, not for comparing qualitative numbers.

Please write in full in the statistical analysis section which tests were used in this article.

Was the t-test used to compare qualitative and count numbers?

In which year was the one-year study conducted? Add the year and month.

A P value below 0.05 means that the difference is significant; in the first paragraph of the Results you wrote that it is higher, but in the parentheses the P value is above 0.05, meaning there is no difference.

Explain Table 2 further.

All items were done.

Reviewer 3:

Title: should be modified as” in clinical isolates”: The Potency of Tedizolid, Linezolid, and Vancomycin against Extensively Drug-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus in Clinical Isolates.

Methods

It is correct.

There is no information about the source of samples from control group. More details is required about control group. What is the justification for sampling from healthy control group?

Nasal area and Skin were considered as control group.

Results

An additional Table is required about the infections from which the sample was obtained.

The purpose was to compare different samples, not infections.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:Where did you use ANOVA or its nonparametric equivalent Kruskal-Wallis, where the t-test, and where Kolmogorov-Smirnov? What test did you use for Tables 1 and 2? Please consult a statistics specialist. Remove the extra color in the graphs

To examine the distribution of the samples in the hospital wards, Kruskal-Wallis was used, and for the normality of the data distribution and recording of Table 1, Kolmogorov-Smirnov was used; and, with respect, the statistical work was performed by the corresponding author's statistician colleague. The extra colors of the table were removed according to the respected reviewer's comment. Reviewer 2:The following parts of my comments were not answered by author:1. In my opinion, the hospital staff as the nasal carriers of S. aureus in neonatal wardconsidering as control and comparing to newborn child nasal flora; could not be a rationalcomparison.

Your statement is correct but please take it into consideration that about 30% of average people are nasal carriers of S.aureus and it's not related to working in a hospital ward .

In lines 197 and 198 : "In the present research, patients (13.8%) and control (3.2%)
individuals were shown resistance to daptomycin" But your research was not about "Daptomycin"

I mentioned it in the last revies , please see the first line in table 1 and 3.2 section.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 3 Oct 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 3 Oct 2021

No comment.

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to the respected reviewer

After examining the data distribution or the test of independence and confirmation with Kolmogorov-Smirnov, nonparametric statistical methods were used

and the edited text has been highlighted in blue.

4 Revision 3

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

5

Revision 4

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to the review

Our data were quantitative and were obtained through measurement. The use of a nonparametric test was due to the rejection of the normality assumption.

5 Revision 4

0 comments

No public comments in this round.