Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 23 · Issue 4 · e96533

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Antioxidant Effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Enriched with Selenium Against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Infection

Khadijeh Mansouri-Habibabadi, Mahnoosh Fatemi, Fereshte Ghandehari

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24 Jul 2019 | 3 Oct 2020 | 26 Oct 2020 | 10.5812/zjrms.96533 |

## 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** Ali Reza Dashipour, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Ali Reza Dashipour ..... 4
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 5
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 7
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 8
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 9
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 10

## 1 Original submission

4 comments · 3 Oct 2019 – 26 Oct 2019

### Ali Reza Dashipour Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 3 Oct 2019

_ P< 0.05 or P< 0.01 is correct; please consider this.
_ Please report the exact P value, not as P< 0.05 or P< 0.01.
_ Please define the symbols used in the tables and figures.

### Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 25 Oct 2019

This review is very interesting; however, I have some concerns and comments as follows:

1) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required.
2) The introduction is not clear & is very poor in terms of scientific writing. Please rewrite it. Also, add one paragraph of approximately 2-3 sentences with information about Selenium (Se). I recommend that the authors use the following article in the text. For further guidance, the following article must be cited in the text, especially in the first paragraph of the introduction:
- Kavyani, B., Arabestani, M.R., Nejad, A.S.M., Moradkhani, S., Kamarehei, F., Taheri, M. and Alikhani, M.Y., 2019. The effect of Cinnamon bark on the expression of quorum sensing system and virulence genes in pseudomonas aeruginosa strain PAO1. Research Journal of Biotechnology, 14(2), pp.42-48.
3) Keywords should be listed alphabetically.
4) All keywords should be provided according to MeSH terms at:
http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html.
5) Correct the spelling of the bacterial names, italicize them, and apply these corrections throughout the text.
6) The authors should use one space between a number and its unit.
7) Numbers less than 10 should be written as words. Numbers 10 or more should be written as numerals.
8) All abbreviations should be written out in full at first use in the text, and the abbreviations should be used thereafter. Please define any abbreviation at first use.
9) In the methodology section, the Ethics Committee's approval is missing. Please provide this information. Also, the statistical analysis should be fully described.
10) Change “(intragastrically) every other day (to tolerate gavage stress)” to “given intragastrically by gavage every other day.”
11) There is a mistake in this wording that prevents it from being understood: “the suspension was washed by centrifuge at 3000 rpm.” Do you wash by centrifuge?
12) The discussion is brief, and the authors must also use recent research articles published after 2016 through 2019. Use a maximum of 4-6 papers for comparison with your study results.
13) The conclusion is not supported by the reported findings. It should be modified.
14) Check all references according to the author structure.

For more details, I have attached the file and indicated some of my comments in the text one by one. Also, all changes in the manuscript should be identified using red font and yellow highlighting.

## Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 26 Oct 2019

Major Revision

## Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 26 Oct 2019

Major Revision

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.

Date: 2020

**Title:** Antioxidant Effect of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Enriched with Selenium against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection

**To:** Professor Alireza Bakhshipour, Editor-in-Chief of Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences

Dear Dr. Alireza Bakhshipour

Thanks of your attention and considerations

We appreciate Reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions on the structure of our manuscript.

We have modified the manuscript accordingly, and detailed corrections are listed below point by point. Also in the text all of the changes are shown in red color and yellow highlight.

**Responses to Reviewer 1**

1) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required

Response 1: Thank you very much for your suggestion.Corrections were made in this regard

2) The introduction is not clear & very poor in terms of scientific writing. So, rewrite again, please. Also, add one paragraph nearly 2-3 sentences about Selenium (Se) information. However, I recommend the authors used these articles in the text. For more your guide following article must be cited in the text especially in the first paragraph on the introduction:
- Kavyani, B., Arabestani, M.R., Nejad, A.S.M., Moradkhani, S., Kamarehei, F., Taheri, M. and Alikhani, M.Y., 2019. The effect of Cinnamon bark on the expression of quorum sensing system and virulence genes in pseudomonas aeruginosa strain PAO1. Research Journal of Biotechnology, 14(2), pp.42-48.

Response 2: Introduction was rewritten

3) Keywords should be listed alphabetically.

Response 3: The keywords were corrected alphabetically

4) All keywords should be provided according to MeSH terms at: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html.

Response 4: All keywords were corrected according to MeSH terms

5) Correct the name of bacteria in italic and spelling and follow in the whole text.

Response 5: The names of the bacteria were corrected throughout the text

6) The authors should be use one space between a number and its unit.

Response 6: The distance between the numbers and their units was added

7) Numbers less than 10 are words. And also, numbers 10 or more are numbers.

Response 7: Unfortunately, I did not understand this sentence.
If you mention this in the text, I will correct it

8) All of the abbreviations should be complete at first use on the text and then use the abbreviation. Please define any abbreviation at first use.

Response 8: Thankful, Corrected in the text

9) In the methodology section, the Ethics Committee's approval is missing. Please provide this information. Also, statistical analysis should be completely described.

Response 9: Unfortunately, this university unit did not have an ethics committee for animal Experimentation before 2017. Therefore, animal experiments were performed according to Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC). In “Ethical Considerations”, the correct sentence was written and its reference was added to the references section
Statistical analysis was rewritten.

10) (intragastrically) every other day (to tolerate gavage stress) change to “given intragastrically by gavage every other day.”
Response 10: Corrected in the text

11) There is a mistake in this wording that prevents its understanding: the suspension was washed by centrifuge at 3000 rpm. Do you wash by centrifuge?
Response 11: Thankful, Corrected in the text

12) The discussion is brief, and also the authors must use new reports of research articles after the year 2016 to 2019. Maximum 4-6 papers for comparing your results study.
Response 12: New reports and research were added to the discussion

13) The conclusion is not supported with reported findings. Should be modified.
Response13: The conclusion was rewritten

14) Check all references according to the author structure.
Response 14: References were checked and corrected

**Responses to Reviewer 2**

1) P< 0.05 or P< 0.01 are correct, please consider that.
Response 1: Unfortunately, I did not understand the meaning of the sentence. If you mention this error in the text, I will correct it

2) please write p value exactly not as P< 0.05 or P< 0.01

Response 2: Thankful, Corrected in the text

3) Please determine symbols that used in tables and figures.
Response 3: The symbols are defined below the tables and shapes

Again, we thank the reviewers for their useful comments which helped our manuscript to be evaluated and improved. We hope our responses could satisfy and assure all questionable points.

The manuscript has been resubmitted to Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. We are looking forward to hear from you.
Sincerely yours
Mahnoosh Fatemi
Department of Biology, Falavarjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

## 2 Revision 1

1 comment · 11 Sep 2020

**Ali Reza Dashipour** Reviewer

ACCEPT 11 Sep 2020

The comments were completed.
Check the English grammar; for example, in some places, "group control" is used.

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.

Response to the comments

With greetings and respect to the honorable reviewers

I am very grateful for the time you spent reading my manuscript, and thank you, dear colleagues, for your valuable suggestions

The corrections made in the text are marked with green highlighting

*Reviewer 1:*
*Comments were done*
*Check the English grammar, for example, in some places it is written group control*

- Thanks for the respected reviewer's comment. The text was read again. Given the table and graphs, since the comparison of the groups was performed both with the control and with the infected group, wherever it seemed that the results would be better understood, the comparison with the control was stated, and in some places with the infectious group

*Reviewer 2:With greetings,I kindly ask the respected authors to carefully review the attached file. Also, regarding the statistical analysis, I have a few questions and suggestions for the respected authors:1- Why did they not examine the homogeneity of variance of the groups with Levene's test (Levene's Test) before the analysis??*

- Thanks for the respected reviewer's comment. Levene's test is performed to check the correctness of random sampling. In this study, the population of rats used was similar in terms of strain, sex, age and weight between the different species, and the only difference among these animals was the treatments during the experiment. Levene's test is used more in human studies.

*2- Given that the number in each group was 6, for this sample size it would have been better to use the Shapiro-Wilk test (Shapiro-Wilk Test) instead of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test).*

- *This test was performed at the discretion of the supervisors and the reviewer. However, in accordance with the respected reviewer's comment, the Shapiro-Wilk Test was also performed, which had a result similar to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test.*

*3- It would have been better if they had reported the test statistic and significance value of the analysis of variance in Table 1.*

- Thanks for the respected reviewer's comment. In Table 1, the numbers are shown as mean ± standard deviation, and since the significance level is mentioned in the text, its repetition in the table was avoided

*With many thanks*

## 3 Revision 2

3 comments · 19 Oct 2020 – 26 Oct 2020

**Referee 1** Reviewer — ACCEPT 19 Oct 2020

I accept this article for publication in the Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences.

**Associate Editor** — ACCEPT 26 Oct 2020

Accept

**Editor-in-Chief** — ACCEPT 26 Oct 2020

Accept