Paper: **"Isolation and Identification of Multidrug-Resistant Raoultella terrigena as a Causative Agent of Urinary Tract Infection in Pregnant Women in the South of Libya"**

Corresponding Author: Abdlrhman Alsonosi

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Doina Georgescu
"Victor Babes" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Timisoara

Reviewer 2: Khaled Ibrahim
Tripoli University, Lybia

Reviewer 3: Mohamed Fadel
De Montfort University, UK

Reviewer 4: Ahmed Dawah
University of Lincoln, UK

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

I suggest not to usr abbreviations in the title. The title may be :" Raoultella terrigena as a rarely causative agent of urinary tract infection in pregnant women"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is acceptable

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

L11 Instead of human should be humans or human recipients
L29 Instead of harbour should ne harbor
L37 The abbreviation of multi drug resistance should be made immediately, when first introducing this notion.
L48 ...was considered instead of consider
L39 ...units instead of unit
L57-59 Denomination of antibiotics should be uniformely written: either in capital letters or small letters.
L71 ... focuses instead of focus
L73 ... The abbreviation UTI should be precedeed by the exact meaning such as: urinary tract infection
L91 ... bacteria is the plural form from bacterium. So instead of bacteria the authors should use bacterium

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It is not clear which type of article is this one? To me it looks like something between case report and revue.
If we don't exactly know the type of the article it is quite difficult to rate the methodology.
The article states the methodology related to microbiological diagnosis of this particular urinary infection.

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

The chapter Results begins with a paragraph of discussions. Which is unacceptable. Results should be clearly presented first, including more info about these two young pregnant women. The authors should better explain how severe were these infections and how could these bad situations influence the pregnancies outcome? Moreover, the

decision to go for antibiotics took into account the possibility of potential foetal damage? What happened with the one of the patients who did not cure?

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

First paragraphs from conclusions are in fact discussions. They have to be removed from the chapter of conclusions. See L116-118
Conclusions should be rewritten in order to emphasize the rarity of this kind of urinaryi nfection, etc, etc.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References :OK

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Authors,
It is mandatory to state from the begining the exat type of your article. After that you can present the methodology you used in your work. in order to be reproducible by other researchers.
Always clearly report your results first and that make the commnents in the chapter of discussions.
Conclusions should not be, by any means, mixed-up with discussions.
Also, pay attention to the details: better not to use abbreviations in the title. The abbreviation should be done in the text, first time when you use a particular term.
Your English spelling needs to be improved.

Reviewer O:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes the Title is clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Authors need to add a few lines in the abstract to present the objective & methodology, that they use.

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

Yes, there are a few grammatical errors in the article such as in Line 45 (For urine culture, a quantity of urine was cultured on Blood agar, McConkey agar) it should be For urine culture, a quantity of urine was cultured on Blood agar and McConkey agar. and there are a few mistakes similar to this, so I would suggest a proof read before the final submission.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the methods are clear, and one comment is that the authors need to add the name of the company (Manufacturer) of the media they used to grow the bacteria.

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

I would suggest a proofreading to the article before the final submission

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, one comment here is to please make sure that the names of the bacteria in the references are in italics

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper Title (Isolation and identification of MDR Raoultella terrigena as a Causative agent of urinary tract infection in Pregnant Women in the South of Libya) by Almthnany et al, reports the identification and isolations of Two strains of R. terrigena, during a study searching of the most common cause of bacterial urinary

tract infection in south of Libya, Urine samples were used in this study and urinalysis and urine culture was carried out to examine the sample, furthermore, Biochemical identification was used for the identification. overall, the paper was easy to understand to fellow and draw conclusions. however, there is always room to improve ;

I would suggest

1- proof read for the paper as there are a few grammatical errors

2- add more about the objective and methodology in the abstract.

3- in Line 54 (Antibiotic sensitivity test) can you list the antibiotics used, in the table instead.

5- make sure to check the name of the bacteria written in italics, in the reference section.

Reviewer P:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

yes it is

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

No,
Probably better to extend it, mention the place of the study.

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

Line 12: change the word (searching) into "investigating".
Line 18: et al must be always italic. Please consider this in whole paper.
Line 48: Language, "considered".

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Line 51: first, you need to mention that the fresh pure culture of isolated pathogen has been used in the test. Second, you must mention the bacterial strain used for API test as a control. This test is crucial test in judgement your findings, it must be carried out by using known bacterial strain as reference for quality control requirement.
Also mention what biochemical tests are using in identifying this pathogen regardless if they are cross reacted with Klebsiella pneumonia.
Line 54: Did you use Muller-Hinton agar, please add it to the text. Also, mention the bacterial strain used as control in antibiotic susceptibility test.

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

Line 79: Mention here that ideally 16s RNA assay is the standard method to identify this pathogenic bacteria, indicate the reader you are aware of golden standard methods for identification of this bacteria.

Line 81: Delete (Ahmed et al, 2019) as this reference is preprint, not yet peer reviewed paper.

Lines 93 to 98: Make more deep discussion here, for example: state that these strains revealed slightly different antibiotic resistant profiles, which means that they are potentially representing different strains of R. terrigena harbouring different encoded resistance genes.

Furthermore : support your findings of antibiotic resistant by citing more references which have obtained similar/semi-similar findings of this research. Then, accordingly open insights to future works focusing on characterising the genes responsible for antibiotic resistance within these isolated strains.

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

Line 114: this is very nice conclusion,
I would add that molecular genetics methods are highly required to be introduced in routine and research work in the hospitals and clinic in Libya to detect the infections of R. terrigena and to generalise database for comprehensive research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Line 122: delete this reference as it is preprint.
or check if the paper has been published somewhere else, has been peer reviewed.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer Q:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is very short, and should be expanded,
Should inform how many samples have been used in this study
Methods should be expanded (Is it enough method to identify these isolates?). Use for example capsule production method and oxidase and motility test.
Results is OK

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

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes the study METHODS are explained clearly, but need more expanded

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

yes the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors, except tables should be as pre-journal requirements

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

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

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate, but should be the same style.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No Comments