



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_18956
Title of the Manuscript:	Laboratory Evaluation of Clinical Bacterial Isolates for Detection of Carbapenemases-Producing Enterobacteriaceae in Kano, North West, Nigeria.
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 comment (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Modified Hodge Test is not indicated for non-fermenting gram-negative bacilli. This method is used for Enterobacteriaceae. This is also why no carbapenemase were confirmed with P. aeruginosa noting it has resistance to imipenem or meropenem. 2. Lines 92 to 95. All isolates were tested for Ceftriaxone and Cefotaxime. These antibiotics are of the same sub-class, meaning they will have the same reactions or interpretations even you are just only testing one. In other words, a sensitive ceftriaxone also means sensitive to cefotaxime, a resistant cefotaxime also means resistance to ceftriaxone. Another thing is, according to the M100-S23 document of CLSI, P. aeruginosa must not be tested by these 2 because they don't have anti-Pseudomonal activity or have the intrinsic resistance.	1. Noted and accepted. 2. This too is noted and accepted as valid observation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Your study is entitled "Laboratory Evaluation of Clinical Bacterial Isolates for Detection of Carbapenemases-Producing Enterobacteriaceae in Kano, North West, Nigeria," why include Pseudomonas aeruginosa? 2. Kindly arranged your tables in a way that it matches the results. 3. Please check your spelling especially the	1. This observation was noted earlier and the result for this isolate of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> was removed from the presentation. 2. Noted and effected. 3. This was noted as observed earlier and



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Scientific names. 4. The study is of 2014, why not use for breakpoints mentioned in M100-S24 instead.	the corrections effected. 4. Not clear to my comprehension.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		