

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_131390
Title of the Manuscript:	DETECTION OF CARBAPENEM-RESISTANT GENES ASSOCIATED TO HOSPITAL-ACQUIRED GRAM-NEGATIVE BACTERIAL PATHOGENS FROM A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN LAGOS, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b> Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This study was conducted in Lagos, Nigeria where molecular epidemiology data is scarce. Therefore, molecular data like these could be insightful for the researchers who are currently working or hoping to work in these regions. This study offers a foundational overview of Lagos's carbapenem resistant profile. However, this paper has major limitations and requires several major changes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, abstract is comprehensive. However, I noticed a discrepancy in the abstract. In abstract, in methodology section, author writes “The carbapenem-resistant genes of the bacterial strains were detected by real-time Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) using carbapenemase primers”. However, I noticed that author used conventional multiplex polymerase chain reaction for amplification instead of real-time Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR), as mentioned in this line. Same thing can be observed in discussion section.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, although result section is significantly concise and may require extra data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Discussion section of this manuscript require additional citations and please avoid repeated citation as much as possible.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, however some of the paragraphs are missing punctuations and some sentences are too long.	
Optional/General comments	<div>1. An introduction section is needed that includes a brief explanation of blaNDM, blaKPC, blaIMP and blaVIM, along with the rationale for selecting these specific carbapenem-resistant to amplify in this study. Is the selection of these genes based on their prevalence in the region, or is it solely influenced by global prevalence?</div> <div>2. The study used urine and wound cultures of patient. Manuscript require explanation for exclusion of other samples such as sputum, blood, swabs, and other body fluids such as CSF, pleura, peritoneal, pericardial, synovial, drain, bile.</div> <div>3. Paragraph spacing within the manuscript is not consistent.</div> <div>4. Figure 1 needs to be cropped to include only gel in the image and please label Ladder, samples and amplified genes on wells of the gel or near the wells.</div> <div>6. Tabulation of PCR programs will be much clearer than writing in sentences as it is seen in 2.7 section of methodology.</div> <div>7. In result section, mentioning about other isolates that were phenotypically carbapenem resistant as well as information about which part of hospital wards/section those carbapenem resistant</div>	

Review Form 3

	<p>isolates were isolated will add more depth to this manuscript.</p> <p>8. If the author has performed any carbapenemase test or MIC, then do mention in the result section.</p> <p>9. In discussion section, please mention other paper's carbapenem resistant rate in nosocomial infection within the region and country.</p> <p>10. Furthermore, concise note on other carbapenem resistant genes circulating in that region could be more insightful.</p>	
--	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anupama Gurung
Department, University & Country	Australia