

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_118210
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends in the prevalence and antibiotic resistance of <i>Ureaplasma urealyticum</i> strains isolated during sperm culture at the biology laboratory of the Institut National d'Hygiène Publique (INHP) in Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire), 2018 to 2021
Type of the 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- The present study is of considerable importance to the scientific community. It provides critical data on <i>U. urealyticum</i>'s prevalence and resistance patterns, offers insights into male infertility, and highlights the need for effective public health interventions.</p> <p>2- The title covers the main aspects of the study: prevalence, antibiotic resistance, and the specific organism and context. Moreover, it could be refined for better readability and impact. I could be revised as following: "Prevalence and Antibiotic Resistance of <i>Ureaplasma urealyticum</i> in Sperm Cultures: A Retrospective Analysis".</p> <p>3-The abstract provided is comprehensive and meets the essential criteria for clarity, detail, and relevance. Minor improvements, such as adding background context and emphasizing key findings and implications as well as English revision, could enhance its effectiveness and clarity.</p> <p>4- The manuscript follows a traditional structure that is familiar and accessible to readers in the scientific community. However. Including a brief subsection on the epidemiology and clinical significance of <i>U. urealyticum</i> could provide better context for the study's importance.</p> <p>5- The study's findings are in line with established knowledge and methodologies, contributing valuable data on the prevalence and antibiotic resistance of <i>Ureaplasma urealyticum</i>.</p> <p>6- The manuscript's references cover relevant topics, but additional references could strengthen the sections on epidemiology, resistance trends, and diagnostic methods. However, more up-to-date sources are recommended, particularly for the latest trends and methods.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the language quality of the manuscript is sufficient for scholarly communication, but requires significant revision to meet the high standards expected in academic publishing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Ali Hosseini
Department, University & Country	Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Iran