# Microbes Infect Chemother Editor Decision

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER A

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the

   article Regular

Remarks

The title and the manuscript have a certain relationship, but the scientific relevance of the manuscript is not clear, apparently are preliminary results that require other types of tests and analysis.

**Response**: This is an initial finding of a currently ongoing project. Other tests and analysis are to be conducted. Please it should be noted that, this research is being conducted in developing country in a region where these preliminary findings have not been established before and this what made it relevance.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Good

Remarks

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Regular

Remarks

The manuscript is not clearly justified
Work must be changed to another verb that allows defining what was done in the study

**Response:** As mentioned on the relevance of topic. This is an initial finding and also a back born of the aim of ongoing study. We hope to identify multidrug resistance isolates and also identify the resistance genes molecularly

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and

analysis. Poor

Remarks

Not have a materials and methods section
The information of each equipment and reagent used for the realization of the manuscript must be placed in materials and methods

**Response**: The manuscript has the material and method section and all the material and reagents used were mentioned in each procedure employed.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs

shown. Poor

Remarks

The results must be described, it is not enough to place the tables

**Response**: Tables were used to describe the results because it gives detail explanation of my antimicrobial susceptibility results than graph or figure.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Remarks

Results should not be described in the discussion section.

Response: I described my results briefly in discussion part to compare it in agreement or disagreement of previous similar researches

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Remarks

The conclusion should be written based on the aim of the manuscript and the significance of the results obtained.

**Response**: The conclusion were written base on the aim and results obtained

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver

format. Poor

Remarks

**Response**: Reference were corrected in accordance with Vancouver format

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar

mistakes? Needs some language corrections

**Response**: The manuscript were revised for any language error and were corrected accordingly

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

The manuscript does not comply with the instructions for the authors, the title is longer, it does not have a materials and methods section and the tables are between the text.
The scientific names of bacteria are misspelled in some sections
The approval number by the Ethics Committee must be placed
To give more scientific weight to the document, the molecular identification of isolated bacteria is essential.

Response: All observation were noted and were responded accordingly

---

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER C

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the

article Regular

Remarks

It will be better if OPD term is used ,in stead of Some hospitals.

**Response**: OPD was included in the title

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Regular

Remarks

Please reframe

**Response**: noted and responded

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Regular

Remarks

Reframe

**Response**: noted and responded

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and

analysis. Poor

Remarks

Procedure is very lengthy.Please make it short. How Sample size was determined.What was the sampling methods. does other history are also taken -such as smoking,COPD,Immunocopromised state. Which statistical technique is used for data analysis.

**Response**: noted and responded accordingly

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs

shown. Regular

Remarks

Graph may be use

**Response**: Tables were used to describe the results because it gives detail explanation of antimicrobial susceptibility results than graph or figure.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Remarks

In case of isolation of Burkholderia pseudomallei and Aeromonas hydrophila,write down some specific detailes about patient and history if possible.

**Response**: *Burkholderia pseudomallei* and *Aeromonas hydrophila* were isolated in sputum of patients with other underlined medical conditions such as HIV, hypertension and diabetic patients

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Remarks

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver

format. Regular

Remarks

**Response**: Reference were corrected in accordance with Vancouver format

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?
Needs some language corrections

**Response**: The manuscript were revised for any language error and were corrected accordingly

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

This study will provide data to help in recomendation for empirical managment of LRTI in Nigeria. Data shold be presented in graphical manner and Authors should give focus to statistical methods used and sample size determination part too.

**Response**: All observation were noted and were responded accordingly

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER D

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the

article Regular

Remarks

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Poor

Remarks

**Response**: it was noted and responded accordingly

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Poor

Remarks

**Response**: it was noted and responded accordingly

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and

analysis. Poor

Remarks

**Response**: it was noted and responded accordingly

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs

shown. Poor

Remarks

**Response**: it was noted and responded accordingly

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Remarks

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Poor

Remarks

**Response**: it was noted and responded accordingly

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance

with the Vancouver format. Poor

Remarks

**Response**: Reference were corrected in accordance with Vancouver format

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling

or grammar mistakes? Requires a thorough assessment of grammar

and spelling

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

The manuscript submitted for review is interesting, however, it should take better care of the description of the study and its results. It is difficult to read and interpret. Suggestions are included in the attached word.

**Response**: All observation were noted and were responded accordingly

---