

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_95621
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiogram and MAR indices of bacterial isolates from urine of diabetics and non-diabetics attending some Hospitals in Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>I consider the manuscript important because it addresses a topic of global concern that is microbial resistance and its relationship with a vulnerable group such as diabetic patients. In the title they mention the MAR index but within the text they do not mention it, nor do I see it in the bibliographical references.</p> <p>The reading of the abstract approximates the content of the article</p> <p>Presentation of results is confusing</p> <p>Lacks update regarding antibiograms</p> <p>It is necessary to review the most updated CLSI and in the part that refers to the recommendations</p> <p>The research is interesting because it touches on aspects of current and future concern regarding bacteria with potential resistance to antibiotics and its impact on vulnerable patients such as diabetic patients in whom a higher incidence of resistant bacteria was detected. However, some situations are detected that I list below.</p> <p>1. Although it is part of the title of the article, the MAR index is not defined in the text.</p> <p>2. Despite the fact that the CLSI recommendations were mentioned in the text, they are not among the bibliographical references.</p> <p>3. In CLSI recommendations are made such as that antibiograms should not be done with antibiotics that are not used with certain bacteria, for example if it is a Gram negative Vancomycin should not be given.</p> <p>4. In the boxes they put the names of incomplete bacteria Example <i>P. fontium</i> whose genus is <i>Pragia</i>.</p> <p>I think that the methodology could be better outlined using the CLSI recommendations that are updated every year.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	As for the language, I have no objections.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Nora Ortiz de Moreno
Department, University & Country	University of Panama, Panamá