

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_126840
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Resistance and Associated Factors of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> Isolated from wounds of Patients in Keffi Nigeria.
Type of the Article	

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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	This manuscript provides important data on the prevalence and antibiotic resistance patterns of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> in wound infections in Nigeria, highlighting the growing issue of multidrug resistance and ESBL-producing strains. These findings are valuable for local healthcare practices and can inform public health initiatives. However, the manuscript could benefit from deeper clinical analysis and more detailed recommendations. Overall, the study is relevant and contributes to the ongoing fight against antibiotic resistance in resource-limited settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is generally suitable as it clearly indicates the focus of the study— <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> isolation and its antibiotic resistance profile in Keffi. However, it could be made slightly more concise and specific. Here's a suggestion: " Prevalence and Antibiotic Resistance Profile of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> in Wound Infections in Keffi, Nasarawa State, Nigeria " This revision emphasizes the key points: prevalence, antibiotic resistance, and the specific location of the study.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could benefit from some minor revisions for clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions:</p> <p>Clarity and Flow: The sentence "The incidence of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> was highest among those aged 21-40 years 8(3.16%), while the least was seen among those aged greater than 60 0(0%)." could be rephrased for better clarity. For example: "The highest incidence of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> was observed in the 21-40 age group (3.16%), while the lowest was in those aged over 60 years (0%)."</p> <p>Methodology Detail: The phrase "253 wound samples from three hospitals (Federal Medical Centre Keffi: 198, Silvercord Hospital Keffi: 43 and Amosun Hospital Keffi: 12) were analysed..." could be made more concise. Consider: "A total of 253 wound samples were collected from three hospitals: 198 from Federal Medical Centre Keffi, 43 from Silvercord Hospital, and 12 from Amosun Hospital."</p> <p>Results: The highest incidence of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> was found in the 21-40 age group (3.16%), while the lowest was in those over 60 years (0%). Females (2.76%) had a higher incidence than males (2.37%). The highest incidence was among self-employed individuals (1.98%). The isolates were highly resistant to ceftazidime and streptomycin (100%), but 61.53% were sensitive to imipenem. Only 23.08% of isolates were ESBL producers.</p> <p>Conclusion: <i>P. aeruginosa</i> isolates from wounds showed high resistance to common antibiotics. Despite the low incidence of ESBL production, there is a need for increased surveillance and public health awareness regarding wound management and antibiotic usage.</p> <p>These revisions help clarify and streamline the abstract for better readability while maintaining the key information.</p> <p>Results: The highest incidence of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> was found in the 21-40 age group (3.16%), while the lowest was in those over 60 years (0%). Females (2.76%) had a higher incidence than males (2.37%). The highest incidence was among self-employed individuals (1.98%). The isolates were highly resistant to ceftazidime and streptomycin (100%), but 61.53% were sensitive to imipenem. Only 23.08% of isolates were ESBL producers.</p> <p>Conclusion: <i>P. aeruginosa</i> isolates from wounds showed high resistance to common antibiotics. Despite the low incidence of ESBL production, there is a need for increased surveillance and public health awareness regarding wound management and antibiotic usage.</p> <p>These revisions help clarify and streamline the abstract for better readability while maintaining the key information.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate, with clear sections for the introduction, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion, and recommendations. However, there could be slight improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Results Section: The results are presented clearly, but the interpretation of the statistical significance could be more concise. For example, avoiding repetition of P-values and instead focusing on the main findings could make the results more streamlined. Discussion and Conclusion: The discussion is detailed, but some of the comparisons with previous studies seem overly long. A more focused discussion that highlights key differences or similarities would improve clarity. Recommendations: The recommendations are relevant but could be more concise, focusing on the most actionable points. <p>Overall, the manuscript follows a logical structure, but some sections could benefit from trimming and tightening the language for brevity and clarity.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor by employing standard bacteriological methods for isolating and identifying <i>P. aeruginosa</i>, as well as widely accepted protocols for antibiotic susceptibility testing (e.g., Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion method). The study's design is appropriate for the research question, using a cross-sectional approach with a clear sampling method across multiple hospitals. The results are supported by relevant statistical analysis, and comparisons with previous studies enhance the manuscript's validity. However, the manuscript would benefit from clearer data interpretation and more precise discussion of the findings, but overall, the methodology and results indicate technical soundness in the research approach.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The list includes a wide range of references from various geographic regions and hospital settings, which is a strength. For example, studies from Africa (Nigeria, Ethiopia), Asia (Saudi Arabia, Iran), and other regions give a global perspective on the issue of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> resistance.</p> <p>While the current references cover a lot of ground, there could be more references related to novel antimicrobial agents or advanced therapeutic approaches (such as phage therapy, nanotechnology, or immunotherapy) that are increasingly being explored for resistant infections. It would also be beneficial to include references that focus on infection prevention and control strategies in hospital settings, as this is crucial for managing <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> outbreaks.</p> <p>The references are generally sufficient and up-to-date, but including more focused references on emerging treatments and prevention strategies could strengthen the research further.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication but require some improvement in clarity and grammar. There are occasional issues with sentence structure, punctuation, and the use of scientific terminology that could be refined for greater precision. Additionally, some sections could benefit from better flow to ensure the content is more coherent and accessible to the reader. Overall, while the manuscript conveys the key ideas, it would benefit from a thorough proofreading to improve readability and academic tone.	
Optional/General comments	nothing	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdelkader Alsanousi Gassem Elzen
Department, University & Country	Tripoli University, Libya