

Comments to Referee

Author Contribution Statement

Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy requires that all authors take public responsibility for the content of the work submitted for review.

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Poor

Remarks

the title did not capture the specific objective of the study as well did not align with results section of the manuscript- **changed P1 L1**

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

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

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

Poor

Remarks

The study design should be analytical cross sectional study since a statistical test was used, furthermore the variables of studies analyzed need to be mentioned .In brief also the experimental ,or laboratory protocol used should be explained properly in the methodology section- **Included in P 3 L 2-5, 8-11**

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

the table should also capture specific data used to run the Fisher exact test, and should indicate where there was statistical significance,- **Included Table 2 in P-4, L-18, P- 14**

on the figure they should label area where pathological changes were detected-

We consider the tomography image to be unnecessary, since it is not a clinical case but rather a group of patients and the image is not representative, it should be removed. Comment by another reviewer hence removed the 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

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

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

Acceptable

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

sample size is too small – mentioned in limitation P- 9 L- 5

data analysis is not well detailed – Included Table 2 in P-4, L-19, P- 14

Laboratory procedure such as ELISA need more explanation how the tests were conducted- Included in P-3, L-8-11

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

Poor-

Remarks

There is no correlation between the title and the content of the work- **changed P1 L1**

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

The abstract gives an idea of the content of the work

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

There is a correlation of the content

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

Regular

Remarks

There is a correlation of the content

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- **Included in P-3 L-3, 11**

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

Poor

Remarks

Given the volume of patients studied and having a better correlation, this work lacks a statistical analysis that could be comparative between the tests or between the populations studied.- **Included Table 2 in P-4, L-19, P- 14**

We consider the tomography image to be unnecessary, since it is not a clinical case but rather a group of patients and the image is not representative, it should be removed.- **Removed as per the suggestion**

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

Meets the requirements

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

The conclusions would be supported even more by having a statistical analysis that provides greater reliability of the data.- modified P-9 L-9

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

Good

Remarks

Meets the requirements

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

Acceptable

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

The work is relevant, however it must be supported by a statistical analysis that provides more information about the data and that can support the interpretation of results. The analysis presented is very simple.- Included Table 2 in P-4, L-19, P- 14

SECOND REVIEW

COMMENTS TO THE REVIEWER:

The methods section should be better described.

- It should be explicitly mentioned what type of study it is – mentioned P3, L1
- The type of sampling, the characteristics of the population and the hospital are not described – changed P3, L1
- The procedures performed are not mentioned either – stated in P3, L9
- There is no description of why controls were used and under what criteria they were selected – mentioned in P3, L5

- The inclusion and exclusion criteria should be written in a continuous manner – P3, L19
- There should be an exclusive paragraph with the ethical aspects and the approval document number should be mentioned – added P3, L13
- There should be a paragraph on the statistics used – added P3, L16
- Limitations should be discussed and mentioned better, avoid the subtitle for this section – changed P9, L4.
- Citations in Vancouver style are in parentheses and without superscript – changed in the respective places.