



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14003
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Asymptomatic Bacteriuria among pregnant women attending antenatal care at Semienawi Asmara Health Center
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The paper is well written, and merits publication. However, some corrections are necessary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kindly clarify what means 'blood relative with UTI' (lines 27-28). I don't think there is any strong genetic theory with regard to urinary tract infections (??) 2. UTI as an acronym is not clarified in the abstract. 3. Line 31: I suggest using the term microorganism, not <i>organism</i>, for Escherichia. 4. Line 29: clarify <i>not urinating immediately</i>. What means immediately here? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no strong genetic theory however there some studies suggest that a family history of UTI in a first-degree relative increases the risk of recurrent UTI and pyelonephritis in women. This supports the idea of a genetic influence on defense mechanisms in the urogenital tract. Anatomical factors and alterations (which are more similar among relatives) also play an important role in the pathogenesis of UTI in women. The shortness of the urethra, with its close relationship to the anus, makes it easy for bacteria to ascend in the urinary tract. 2. You are right. It should have been clarified as Urinary tract infection (UTI). 3. The comment is agreeable. Organism should be changed to microorganism. 4. Not urinating immediately means delay in voiding.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Line 62: instead of <i><u>pregnancy is a provocation</u></i> I would suggest <i><u>pregnancy predisposes...</u></i>6. Line 79: is a <i><u>pus cell</u></i> the right term?7. Tables are generally embedded in the PDF file as pictures. This decreases the readability. Please provide tables in separate word documents when submitting the final revised manuscript.8. Line 193: correct terms of microorganisms mentioned.9. Some further grammatical corrections are needed.10. Line 270: kindly substitute <i>mankind</i> with <i>humans</i>.11. Line 321: correct multiparty for <i>multiparity</i>. The same in the line 363.12. Lines 313 and 327 are redundant (duplicated, since you mention twice the incidence of UTI in the US).	<ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Agreeable. Pregnancy predisposes is better than pregnancy is a provocation.6. We agree. "Pus cells" should be changed to "white blood cells".7. A separate word document is prepared for tables with their respective number. I accept the comment as it is.8. The correct names are <i>Entrobacteriaceae</i> and <i>K.pneumoniae</i>.9. Acceptable. Authors of the manuscript are not native English speakers.10. Agree. "mankind" is replaced by "humans".11. We agree with the comment. It was a typing error. The correct word is "multiparity".12. We are sorry for the redundancy. The second should be deleted.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References are not uniform. You should use a single form of references quoted: I suggest use the PubMed format and download references from this source.	The PubMed format was used for references. All changes were marked with yellow to indicate changes has been made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is interesting and merits publication; however I think the points I raised above should be addressed.	Thank you for all the comments you gave. We have corrected the points you have raised.