

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_95337</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Clinico-epidemiology profile and susceptibility pattern of bacterial isolates of purulent samples in a university hospital</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>The article does not add relevant information</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Some major concerns</p> <p>Quite proper</p>	<p>The authors present data on Clinico-epidemiology profile and susceptibility pattern of bacterial isolates of purulent samples in a university hospital in the attempt to mainly define a generale path to follow in empirical treatment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Albeit the article can be of possible interests, there are some major concerns to be addressed:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 the authors has to define the concept of MDR (how did you define a pathogens as MDR?)</li> <li>2 authors should make explicit the criteria by which infections were defined as opposed to mere colonizations. It is known, in fact, that especially when it comes to "wounds" the cultured bacterial flora is often superficial (colonizing). In particular, for wounds it is advisable to enter score such as. Q-score (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofw172.851">https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofw172.851</a>)</li> <li>3 please always report the species of the pathogens not Pseudomonas spp or Enterobacter spp. The antimicrobial susceptibility behavior could be completely different among different species in the same genera.</li> <li>4 Again, Coagulase negative Staphylococcus in not sufficient. Authors have to define which staphylococci were included in this group. Some members of CONS show a behavior similar to coagulase -positive staphylococci.</li> <li>5 Concerning the methods E-test is not the reference approach. Currently to define the profile of resistance/susceptibility of an isolate</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

		<p>it is recommended the Micro-Broth dilution.</p> <p>6 To define an ESBL is not sufficient the screening test .."ceftazidime and ceftriazone and 25% sensitive to cefoperazone-sulbactam.." It is required al least an immunocromatographic assay or better a molecular assay.</p> <p>7 It is particular strange that the authors did not find any carbapenemase producing enterobacterales</p> <p>8 "Sensitive" better "susceptible"Table 2. Why PIP/TAX was not reported for enterobacterales?</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments			
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments			

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Carla Fontana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>INMI L. Spallanzani, Italy</b>