

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_121481</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Occurrence and Antibiotic Resistance profiles of Metallo-beta-lactamase-producing Pseudomonas aeruginosa among clinical isolates in Enugu Metropolis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript throws light on the increasing number of MBL producing P.Aeruginosa infections with meticulous experiments conducted. The prospect of obtaining and culturing over 100 samples is remarkable. However, the data provided and analysed is slightly concerning due to the lack of proof of resistance, statistical explanations and certain fallacies. There is scope for research and writing improvements.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. Minor Suggestion: The deletion or replacement of the sentence "Metalla-beta-lactamase poses a threat to public health." The point has already been mentioned in the introduction of the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes Elaborate study design and statistical portions with more clarity. How was descriptive statistics used? What were all the variables that were compared? Additional graphical inferences can help.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Edits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. [2.1] The study design portion is insufficient as there should be clarity of the entire resistance study possibly with the flowchart. The timeline mentioned is also incorrect since it is November 2021 to July 2021.</li> <li>2. [2.4] How many times was the bacterial species sub-cultured before the test? Include timelines for a more robust study.</li> <li>3. [2.6] If possible, please include a photo of the plate with the labelled antibiotic discs (pre and post incubation)</li> <li>4. [2.7] What were the statistical comparisons? Diameter variations between different strains on agar with imipenem discs? Or between MBL and non-MBL producing strains specifically? How was the p-value obtained?</li> <li>5. [Results] If the focus of validating MBL producing strains is based on the usage of Imipenem discs then the title of the paper can be modified as such (author's discretion). Since only Imipenem was used for assessing resistant strains and carried forward for MBL and non-MBL categorization (68 out of 127 were taken for MBL testing). This should be clearly elucidated in the study design.</li> <li>6. [Results] The interpretation of the resistance percentages is not befitting. The percentage of isolates from each sample (wound, urine, etc.) is appropriate. The % resistant to imipenem should be depicted as [No. of resistant strains from total no. of Catheter samples / Total no. of catheter samples] = 2 / 3 = 66.7%. So, actually the catheter obtained strains show high resistance and future studies can be focused on those isolates (not 2.9% since it is not measured against total samples but only with its own sample group). The results will change accordingly for occurrences as well (in the paragraph). Since samples have been isolated from multiple locations, they must be grouped accordingly and analysed (not by simply totalling).</li> <li>7. [Image] Improved image quality and additional images if possible (with graphs, histograms/bar based on the diameter values of the study for MBL producing strains and antibiotic susceptibilities, at least.</li> <li>8. Discussion has been conveyed extremely well with good comparisons.</li> </ol>	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript is concise and well worded.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The number of samples and the extent of work is commendable. Required: Protocol elucidation and a few analytical tweaks.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Siddarth Sowmyanarayan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pes University, India</b>