

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 Pseudomonas aeruginosa 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Yes, it is important to the scientific community, but some corrections are needed in the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think it's appropriate as a title.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is too concise and lacks detailed results. Adding specific data points, such as percentages of resistance for key antibiotics and notable findings on risk factors, would enhance clarity. Consider adding a sentence to highlight the clinical implications of high antibiotic resistance rates for local healthcare. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology section lacks specifics on sample collection criteria and handling. Detailed descriptions of swab collection and handling procedures are crucial for reproducibility. The statistical methods need more detail, such as specifying how confidence intervals were calculated and the justification for the sample size determination. Additionally, the ethics statement is repeated in two sections, which could be streamlined. The presentation of data, especially the resistance profile tables, is comprehensive, but some descriptions in the text lack interpretative context. For example, providing possible explanations for observed resistance patterns could strengthen the discussion. The study's findings on gender and age differences in prevalence could benefit from further exploration and discussion, especially if related studies have found differing trends. The discussion section compares results with those of other studies, which is helpful. However, more recent studies or meta-analyses on P. aeruginosa resistance trends could add depth to the comparison. Include more interpretation on how local factors (e.g., healthcare practices, environmental factors in Keffi) may explain the observed resistance patterns. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>7- Explicitly stating study limitations, such as potential biases in sample collection from only three hospitals or the lack of molecular analysis of resistance mechanisms, would add transparency.</p> <p>8- The recommendations for future research are promising, but more specific guidance, such as the value of incorporating molecular techniques for resistance genes, would clarify the direction for further studies.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some references appear incomplete or formatted inconsistently, which affects credibility. Correctly formatting citations and ensuring accurate reference information is essential. Consistent table formatting, especially in terms of data alignment and abbreviations, would enhance the readability of results. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are numerous grammar errors (e.g., “The incidence of P. aeruginosa was highest among those aged 21-40 years 8(3.16%)...”). Proofreading for grammatical accuracy and language flow would improve readability and professionalism. The writing should be more concise, avoiding redundancies like “multifactorial and encompass many variables” in the introduction. 	
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aqeel Ismael Gheni
Department, University & Country	Koya University, Iraq