



Paper: “Profil de résistance aux antibiotiques des souches Escherichia coli responsables d’infections urinaires collectées dans le réseau de surveillance de janvier à décembre 2024 au Centre National de Référence pour les Antibiotiques, Institut Pasteur de Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 11 September 2025

Accepted: 30 March 2026

Published: 30 April 2026

Corresponding Author: Konan Kouadio Fernique

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n12p192

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Toure Daouda
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: TOURE Daouda	
University/Country: Université Peleforo GON COULIBALY/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/28/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/02/2026
Manuscript Title: Antibiorésistance des souches d'<i>Escherichia coli</i> responsables d'infections urinaires collectées dans le réseau de surveillance de janvier à décembre 2024 au Centre National de Référence pour les Antibiotiques, Institut Pasteur de Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0226/26	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is clear and adequately reflects the content of the article; however, it could be slightly shortened to improve readability.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>While the abstract includes the objectives, methods, and results, it is overly long and mainly descriptive. The structure could be improved to better distinguish the study objective, key methods, and main findings. In addition, the objective remains somewhat vague and would benefit from greater specificity. The authors are encouraged to clearly highlight the added</i>	

<i>value of the study by indicating how these results contribute to current knowledge or may impact clinical practice and antimicrobial resistance surveillance.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are a few grammatical and spelling errors throughout the manuscript. While these do not severely affect comprehension, they should be corrected to improve readability and adherence to the journal's language standards. Additionally, some sentences are overly long and could be restructured for clarity. Scientific names should be italicized consistently.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>he methodology is generally well described, including the study design, setting, inclusion criteria, microbiological identification, antibiotic susceptibility testing, BLSE detection, and statistical analysis. However, the section is dense and could benefit from clearer subheadings and shorter sentences to improve readability. Some terms should be standardized, such as "urine samples" and the names of antibiotics. Additionally, details on the quantitative results of resistance testing, particularly for gentamicin, and the use of controls in BLSE detection, would strengthen the methodological rigor. Overall, the methodology is sound but could be refined for clarity and completeness.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are generally clear and well presented, with key findings on the distribution of urinary tract infections and the sources of the E. coli strains appear accurate and consistent. The data on antibiotic resistance and BLSE prevalence appropriately highlighted. No obvious errors were detected in the data.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions accurately summarize the main findings of the study, including the prevalence of urinary tract infections, the near-equal distribution between men and women, and the significant proportion of E. coli strains producing extended-spectrum beta-lactamases (37.7%). The practical recommendation to perform urine culture with susceptibility testing is supported by the data. However, the statement regarding inappropriate use of antibiotics, particularly penicillins, is not directly supported by the study data and should either be referenced or qualified. Additionally, the conclusion is somewhat descriptive and could be strengthened by emphasizing the study's novel contributions or potential impact on clinical practice and antimicrobial stewardship</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
<i>The references are comprehensive and relevant, covering the epidemiology, antimicrobial resistance, and molecular mechanisms of E. coli in urinary tract infections both globally and regionally. They include recent publications (2022-2025) and local data from African countries, which strengthens the manuscript. Some minor improvements are suggested: ensure consistent formatting of all references according to journal guidelines, verify page numbers and titles, and prioritize the most relevant and recent sources to avoid redundancy. Additionally, clarify the accessibility of theses and dissertations cited.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

General Comment:

The manuscript addresses a highly relevant topic in public health. The antimicrobial resistance of *Escherichia coli* strains causing urinary tract infections in Côte d'Ivoire. The study is well-conceived, and the data are clearly presented. The findings contribute valuable information for both clinical practice and regional surveillance programs.

Strengths:

- The title accurately reflects the study content.
- The methodology is clearly described and appropriate for the study objectives.
- Results are coherent, accurate, and well-supported by the data.
- References are comprehensive, up-to-date, and cover both regional and global contexts.
- Practical recommendations (routine urine culture with susceptibility testing) are relevant and justified.
- Suggestions for Improvement (Minor Revisions):

1. Abstract:

- The abstract is currently long and overly descriptive. Consider making it more concise.
- Clarify the study objective more precisely, highlighting the purpose and expected contribution.
- Include a brief statement on how the results impact clinical practice or antimicrobial stewardship.

2. Introduction:

- While informative, it could be more focused on the knowledge gap and novelty of the study.
- Consider briefly stating why this study is important for the local context (Côte d'Ivoire) versus existing data.

3. Conclusion:

Some sentences are long and could be split for clarity.

- Statements such as the “inappropriate use of antibiotics, especially penicillins” should be supported with references or phrased cautiously.
- Emphasize the contribution or novelty of your findings, not just a summary of results.

References:

- Ensure consistent formatting according to journal guidelines.
- Verify page numbers, titles, and punctuation.
- Consider prioritizing the most recent and relevant references to avoid redundancy.

Language/Style:

- Minor grammatical adjustments and sentence restructuring could improve readability, particularly in the abstract and conclusion.

Overall Recommendation:

- Accept with minor revision. The manuscript is scientifically sound, relevant, and informative. Addressing the minor points above will strengthen clarity, readability, and impact.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: