

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

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>				
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Review			
	1	Title	The title is concise, informative, and represents the main result effectively.	
	2	Abstracts	<p>Consider that the abstract should be structural.</p> <p>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></p>	
	3	Introduction	<p>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.</p>	
	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	<p>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>).</p>	
	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:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Conny Riana Tjampakasari
Department, University & Country	Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia