

Manuscript: “**Virulence and Resistance Characterization of Staphylococci-associated Urinary Tract Infection in Pregnant Women in Lagos, Nigeria**”

Submitted: 03 September 2021

Accepted: 13 September 2021

Published: 31 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Muinah Fowora

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p135](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p135)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Patrick Kwame Feglo, Department of Clinical Microbiology, School of Medical Sciences, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi

Reviewer 2: Hasan Abd Ali Khudhair, Southern Technical University, Iraq

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title 'Virulence and Resistance Characterization of Staphylococci-associated Urinary Tract Infection in Pregnant Women in Lagos, Nigeria.' is succinct and straightforward.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The aim of the study was stated but the various objectives to achieve the aim were not written. The aim was to characterize the virulence and resistance genes in Staphylococcus species isolated from pregnant women.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

There are many grammatical and spelling errors in the article. The introduction was long verbose and irrelevant to the study. A few lines describing the background is sufficient. What was presented here makes the reader lost to the purpose of the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The study methods were written but with some explanations missing:

1. Polymicrobial bacteriuria is uncommon and actually non-existent.
2. It is not clear how significant bacteriuria was established using the calibrated loop. In urine culture it is not every colony that is considered significant to follow and treat.
3. Blood agar and Mannitol salt agar were the culture media used, it is not stated if every urine cultured yielded bacteria staphylococci. What about the other major causes of UTI?
4. Commonly MacConkey agar and CLED are common culture media employed for urine culture, so that other organisms can be recovered. Equally blood agar can yield Staphylococci and others as well, but why were they not reported?
5. DNA extraction and PCR amplification gene loci determinations were described appropriately but badly written.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the manuscript was badly written. In results it was stated that 21 Staphylococci were isolated and the following statement said it was 24, clearly misleading comments.

The language and syntax were equally inappropriate for example: "These included S. aureus 7 (29%) and CoNS 17 (71%)" is meaningless. So also a sentence like "The CoNS were further identified as Staphylococcus epidermidis 41.1%, Staphylococcus saprophyticus 35.3%, Staphylococcus haemolyticus 11.80%, and other staphylococci 11.8%", is meaningless.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The summary is not exhaustive and accurate. The conclusion was silent on the virulence traits detected.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The references were well cited in text and also in reference list.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors need to consult a clinical microbiologist for assistance, because the conceptual idea is good. Bacteria culture, plate reading and interpretation need to be

done by a clinical microbiologist. The overall language need to be reviewed by an English writer.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in paper file.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in paper file.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in paper file.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in paper file.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in paper file.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in paper file.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in paper file.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

All our recommendations were documented by comments and track changes tools in your paper file (please perform all recommendations precisely).

Best Regards