

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_109766
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of multidrug-resistant enterobacteria isolated from 2019 to 2020 in a tertiary hospital in Dakar-Senegal
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>There are many bacteriologically inappropriate expressions before the "results," making it impossible to continue reading to the discussion. For example, <i>Enterobacter</i> spp. are generally considered to be primarily <i>Enterobacter cloacae</i> complex, and <i>E. aerogenes</i> is included in <i>Enterobacter</i> spp. even though it has been renamed <i>Klebsiella</i> spp. for several years. Gram-negative bacilli should also be referred to as GNR, and enterobacteria should be unified under <i>Enterobacterales</i>.</p> <p>Regarding Table 1, I wonder if it is meaningful to indicate the isolation rate from specimens. It would be good to know what kind of specimens the isolates are mostly from and whether they are mostly a percentage of the total.</p> <p>For Table 2, it is not significant to indicate the department from which the bacteria were isolated, but the origin of the specimen and the type of bacteria isolated from that specimen should be indicated. The reference is also difficult to read, so italics should be used for the bacteria part.</p> <p>I briefly skimmed through the discussion, but it is difficult to say that it adequately describes the areas indicated in the results. The rationale is insufficient and I would expect sufficient description of the ESBL-producing strains in particular. As mentioned above, the study seems to need substantial revision, but we expect it to be resubmitted as it seems to be an important finding in Africa.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	as above-mentioned	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	as above-mentioned	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ryota Ito
Department, University & Country	Tohoku Rosai Hospital, Japan