

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Pathogen Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPR_130742 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Molecular Profiling of Antibiotic-Resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa Isolated from Patients with Urinary Tract Infections in Rivers State University Teaching Hospital |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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> |
|--|--------------------|---|
| 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. | | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative 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. | | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | | |

Review Form 3

| | | | | |
|---|--------|-----------------------|---|---|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | | | |
| Optional/General comments | Review | | | <p>Abstract: molecular techniques was used for confirmatory identification of isolates and gene detection. Other changes were made and painted yellow background.</p> <p>Introduction: additional informations were added and painted yellow background.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: the samples were collected from June 2023 to June 2024, however, the changes were made in sample population and painted yellow background.</p> <p>Results: MAR index were generated by dividing the number of antibiotics to which the isolates is resistant by total number of antibiotics tested.</p> <p>Discussion: The conventional technique is a pre-analytical identification method of isolates, while the molecular is a confirmatory advanced technique of identification. However, one of the objectives of this research was not to show difference in the identification techniques of isolates.</p> |
| | 1 | Title | The title is concise, informative, and represents the main result effectively. | |
| | 2 | Abstracts | Consider that the abstract should be structural. In the method, add what molecular test is used. The keyword is readjusted: antibiotic resistance genes do not need to be written because they are already represented by the previous antibiotic resistance sentence. Conclusion: describe in detail what was obtained in this study, not only the prevalence of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> | |
| | 3 | Introduction | Comprehensive background on <i>P. aeruginosa</i> and its relationship with antibiotic resistance and UTI. However, the importance of molecular examination to detect antibiotic resistance genes is not written. The basis for selecting the gene for the molecular test was also not mentioned. | |
| | 4 | Materials and Methods | Comprehensive and structured. What year was this sample taken and how long did it take? | |
| | 5 | Results | Data is presented clearly using tables and figures, and findings are explained logically. However, explain how to calculate the MAR index and its interpretation. | |
| | 6 | Discussion | Comprehensive interpretation of results, and comparisons with previous studies effectively highlight the study's contribution. However, explain why there is a difference in test results between conventional and molecular (conventionally : 17 positive <i>P. aeruginosa</i> while molecular only 9 are confirmed with 16S Ribosomal RNA and 6 of them are detected as <i>P. aeruginosa</i>). | |
| | 7 | Conclusion | Exploratory further on the findings | |
| | 8 | References | More than 80% of the bibliography used is the most recent 10-year bibliography | |
| | 9 | General comments | The manuscript is well-structured and aligns with standard scientific formats. Only a few minor improvements are needed. | |

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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |