

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_129909
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Antibiotic Resistance Patterns of Multidrug-Resistant <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> in Clinical Specimens from Khartoum Hospitals, Sudan
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: 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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<p>The paper "Prevalence and Antibiotic Resistance Patterns of Multidrug-Resistant <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>....." is very important for understanding the disease burden, dealing with problems related to antimicrobial resistance, improving clinical management, guiding policy and stewardship efforts, planning future research, and giving important regional data to help global networks that monitor resistance grow. It assists healthcare professionals in making informed decisions regarding empirical therapy, diminishes treatment failures and patient deaths, and guides future research on resistance mechanisms.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the results of the current study do not suggest any of the previously mentioned points; they merely examine certain aspects associated with AMR.</p>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<p>The current study's findings failed to provide any information regarding the prevalence of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>; nevertheless, they did reveal the antibiotic resistance patterns of selected antibiotics. This study did not provide the information necessary to categorize as multidrug-resistant.</p> <p>Appropriate Title for This Research: "Antibiotic Resistance Patterns of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> in Clinical Specimens from Khartoum Hospitals, Sudan"</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><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></p>	<p>The background, objective, materials, techniques, and conclusion in the abstracts are not relevant to the paper.</p> <p>Abstract Background: One of the most common causes of nosocomial infection is <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>. Antimicrobial resistance has expanded globally as a result of profound changes in microbial genetic ecology caused by the indiscriminate use of antimicrobials. Objective: The aim of study was to determine the antibiotic resistance pattern of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> isolated from clinical specimens. Material and Methods: ..<b>Duration study and study site is missing</b>. The present study used purposive sampling as the sampling technique. <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> isolated from 77 clinical specimens, Susceptibility Test was determined using Kirby-Bauer Disk Diffusion. Results: The results revealed that and the isolated organism test is <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> was isolated from all the clinical Specimen by 100%, The results revealed that the frequencies of Cefpodoxime antibiotics for the Urine 32.4% (11/31) was sensitive, while 58.8% (20/31) was resistant., for the wound 20.6% (7/34) was sensitive, while 79.4% (27/34) was resistant., for the Ear 5.9% (2/12) was sensitive, while 29.4% (10/12) was resistant. Resistant average for cefpodoxime was 74.0%, and there is a high statistically significant relation between Cefpodoxime antibiotics and samples (Urine and wound) and a normal relation with Ear. Conclusion: ...Rewrite the conclusion depending on the findings...</p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The introduction is excessively long. The information about the ethical clearance certificate is missing. The sample size computation is absent, and the current study does not explain why they collected just 77 isolates. The selection criteria for antibiotics remain unclear, with some antibiotics intrinsically resistant (Cefotaxime) and others not recommended (Cefpodoxime) for <i>Pseudomonas</i> infection. There is also no information on the antibiotics that are recommended for figuring out the AST pattern for <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>This study's essential references are missing, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CLSI. (2021). <i>Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing</i> (31 ed.). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute <a href="https://www.treatacademy/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CLSI-31-2021.pdf">https://www.treatacademy/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CLSI-31-2021.pdf</a></li> <li>2. Gilbert, D. N., Chambers, H. F., Saag, M. S., Pavia, A. T., Boucher, H. W., Black, D., Freedman, D. O., Kim, K., &amp; Schwartz, B. S. (2022). <i>The Sanford Guide To Antimicrobial Therapy</i> (52 ed.). <a href="https://www.sanfordguide.com">https://www.sanfordguide.com</a></li> <li>3. Magiorakos, A. P., Srinivasan, A., Carey, R. B., Carmeli, Y., Falagas, M. E., Giske, C. G., Harbarth, S., Hindler, J. F., Kahlmeter, G., Olsson-Liljequist, B., Paterson, D. L., Rice, L. B., Stelling, J., Struelens, M. J., Vatopoulos, A., Weber, J. T., &amp; Monnet, D. L. (2012). Multidrug-Resistant, Extensively Drug-Resistant and Pandrug-Resistant Bacteria: an International Expert Proposal for Interim Standard Definitions for Acquired Resistance. <i>Clin Microbiol Infect</i>, <b>18(3)</b>: 268-281. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x</a></li> <li>4. Tamma, P. D., Aitken, S. L., Bonomo, R. A., Mathers, A. J., van Duin, D., &amp; Clancy, C. J. (2023). Infectious Diseases Society of America 2023 Guidance on the Treatment of Antimicrobial Resistant Gram-Negative Infections. <i>Clin Infect Dis</i>. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciad428">https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciad428</a></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>grammatical problems.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Pushpa Man Shrestha</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Nepal</b></p>