

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_123623
Title of the Manuscript:	Elizabethkingia meningoseptica bacteremia in a newborn at the University Hospital Yalgado Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso: a case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p><i>Elizabethkingia meningoseptica</i> is an emerging nosocomial opportunistic pathogen recognized as the most virulent among the six known species of the genus <i>Elizabethkingia</i>. While this pathogen has the potential of multi-drug resistance, jeopardizing treatment efforts, it is associated with severe sepsis, meningitis, and pneumonia, particularly in developing regions such as Burkina Faso among other African countries.</p> <p>This is perhaps the second study reporting the outbreak of <i>E. meningoseptica</i> in neonates in Africa, highlighting its significance within the scientific community and emphasizing the urgent need for prompt and effective intervention strategies in Sub-Saharan Africa.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is appropriate.</p>	
<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 well coined.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well structured.</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 authors have reported a serious case of <i>E. meningoseptica</i> infection in a neonate, detailing its clinical manifestations, morphological characterization, and antibiotic susceptibility patterns. However, I have some concerns regarding the methodology. Identifying the organism based solely on morphological characteristics and antibiotic susceptibility patterns is insufficient for definitive confirmation. I recommend that the authors include biochemical characterization of the isolate or conduct a Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) to accurately confirm the organism.</p> <p>Furthermore, in Fig 1, the authors presented the antibiotic susceptibility of the isolate on an agar plate. I recommend that the authors provide the inhibitory diameters for these antibiotics and compare their results with the values specified by the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines. This should also be done for the data presented in Table 1. Also, did the authors use any control organism for the antibiotic susceptibility testing?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>I think this part is okay.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is okay.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seye Julius Oladeji
Department, University & Country	Rice University, United States