

## FIRST REVIEW

Respected reviewers,

We are extremely grateful for all the corrections and feedback that we have received from you. We have made the following changes in response to the suggestions of the reviewers. Authors contributions have been added to the end of the manuscript.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

### 1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

Remarks

\*The author should justify the importance of conducting the study at "a tertiary care hospital". This information should be removed from the title if it is not relevant.

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

\*Improve the writing.

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestion. The justification is given in the last paragraph of introduction.

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

Good

Remarks

\*Improve the writing.

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestion. Changed have been made to improve the writing in general.

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

Regular

#### Remarks

- \*There is a poor description of the selection criteria.
- \*Describe more precisely the concept of “clinically significant” strains.
- \*There is no difference in the presentation of tables and figures, and they are not cited in the manuscript.
- \*Indicate the bibliography that supports the reference range in Table 1, and the resistance pattern in "disk diffusion method" section.
- \*The acronyms should be properly explained (OD, CLSI).
- \*Improve the writing.

**Response :** Thankyou for your suggestion. The selection criteria and concept of “clinically significant” have been better described. Tables and figures have been presented appropriately. The bibliography supporting the reference ranges of Table 1 have been included. All the acronyms have been properly explained and we have improved the writing in general

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?

No

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

Poor

#### Remarks

- \*Describe more precisely the origin or the type of "tissue" analyzed.
- \*Cite important information contained in tables 1, 2, and 3.
- \*Tables 2 and 3 can be unified into a single table.
- \*Improve the writing because there are redundant phrases and problems with the syntax in the sentences.

**Response :** Thankyou for your suggestion. The results have been presented adequately after getting rid of redundant tables and figures. The origin of the the tissues analysed have been described and tables 1 and 2 have been combined into a single one. All grammatical and spelling errors have been thoroughly assessed.

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

- \*The acronyms should be properly explained (UTI, hvKP, CA-UTI).
- \*Rewrite some sentences, because some have the shape of writing similar to the Results section.
- \*Rephrase some sentences into a single one.
- \*Cite the references adequately.
- \*Improve the writing because there are redundant phrases and problems with the syntax in the sentences.

**Response.** Thankyou for your suggestions. Some sentences having the shape of writing similar to the Results section have been rewritten. Certain sentences were rephrased into a single one. Referenced have been cited adequately. All grammatical and spelling errors have been thoroughly assessed.

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

Good

Remarks

- \*Improve the writing

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions. Changes have been made to improve the writing in general.

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

Good

Remarks

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

Requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions. Changes have been made to improve the writing in general. All grammatical and spelling errors have been thoroughly assessed.

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

The author should cite adequately the tables and figures in the text.

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions. Tables and figures have been cited adequately.

---

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----  
1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Good

Remarks

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions

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

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions

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

Good

Remarks

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions

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

Poor

Remarks

They are not following STROBE guidelines

**Response:** Methods section have been rewritten following STROBE guidelines.

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

Many tables and figures

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions. The number of tables and figures have been reduced. Language corrections have been done. The results have been presented adequately after getting rid of redundant tables and figures

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.

Good

Remarks

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions

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

Good

Remarks

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions

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

Good

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

Needs some language corrections

**Response:** Thankyou for your suggestions. . Changes have been made to improve the writing in general. All grammatical and spelling errors have been thoroughly assessed.

We kindly request you to check if the corrections done are adequate.

Thankyou.

Regards

Smrithi Surendranath.

## SECOND REVIEW

Respected reviewers,

We are extremely grateful for all the corrections and feedback that we have received from the second review. The following corrections have been made and highlighted in the revised manuscript.

- In the first paragraph of introduction, gram negative has been reworded as gram-negative
- Acronyms like CSF and OD has been added in the methods section.
- Approved Standard M100-S25. Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute: 2017:104-128 has been replaced by Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute consensus in the methods section
- AmpC detection has been reworded as AmpC beta-lactamase detection
- Legends of all figures have been placed at the bottom of the figures.
- “Prevalence” have been replaced with “frequency” as prevalence is only used for epidemiological studies
- Hyphens have been added at appropriate place and highlighted.
- Missing journal abbreviations have been added to the reference section and highlighted.

Thankyou.

Kind regards

Smrithi Surendranath.