

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_124282
Title of the Manuscript:	Virulence factors and pathogenicity islands in uropathogenic E. coli in children
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -		

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><b>1. Abstract Length and Abbreviations:</b></p> <p>The abstract should not exceed 300 words; however, it currently contains 382 words and needs to be reduced. I noticed that a non-standard abbreviation is presented as a keyword without its full form. I recommend revising the abstract to address these issues for clarity and adherence to the journal's guidelines.</p> <p><b>2. Citations in Text:</b></p> <p>In the manuscript, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets (e.g., [3]). However, I noticed that some citations are formatted using the authors' names followed by the year. I recommend that the authors revise these citations to align with the required format for consistency throughout the manuscript.</p> <p><b>3. Concerns Regarding Citation Accuracy:</b></p> <p>The first line in the introduction cites the study by Rozadowski and colleagues, "Molecular factors and mechanisms driving multidrug resistance in uropathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i> – an update". However, upon cross-verification, I found that the information referenced is not present in that article. This raises concerns about the accuracy of citations. I recommend that the authors review their references to ensure that all cited information is correctly attributed and available in the cited sources.</p> <p><b>4. Comment on Methodology References</b></p> <p>The methodology referenced in the study dates back to 2006 (Sabate <i>et al.</i>, 2006) While this may still be a valid protocol, I would recommend the authors consider citing more recent studies that have employed the same methodology. Including these newer references would enhance the credibility of the methodology and reflect the current usage in the field.</p> <p><b>5. Concerns Regarding Similarity in Wording:</b></p> <p>Upon reviewing the manuscript, I noticed that the statement "Iron, as an electron carrier, plays a key role in basic cellular processes such as cellular respiration, DNA replication, or oxygen transport" (11<sup>th</sup> line in discussion part) is copied verbatim from the cited journal. I found a significant similarity in the description of pathogenicity islands compared to the reference article (47<sup>th</sup> line in discussion part) .Phrasing such as "specific regions of the bacterial chromosome where virulence genes accumulate" is nearly identical to that in the source. This raises concerns about originality and may not be acceptable in its current form. I recommend that the authors revise this section to ensure that the language is sufficiently distinct and properly paraphrased to adhere to academic integrity standards.</p> <p><b>6. Uniformity of Reference Formatting:</b></p> <p>I noticed that some references are presented in different styles throughout the manuscript. To enhance clarity and professionalism, I recommend standardizing</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	all references to adhere to the journal's guidelines. This will improve the overall cohesiveness of the manuscript and ensure consistency in citations.	
--	---	--

**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>V. Viswapriya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rathnavel Subramaniam College of Arts and Science, India</b>