Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 7 · Issue 3 · e103529

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Bacterial Strains and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Patterns in Male Urinary Tract Infections in Duhok Province, Iraq

Ibrahim Naqid, Amer A Balatay, Nawfal R Hussein, Hiba A Ahmed, Kurdistan Abdullah Saeed, Sanya Ali Abdi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
8 Apr 2020	9 May 2020	28 May 2020	10.5812/mejrh.103529

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

3 comments · 29 Apr 2020 – 30 Apr 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 29 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- In the abstract: the number of clones is 105 cfu/ml.
2- It is said that the samples were collected between 2018 and 2020, but in the materials and methods section, it was collected between 2017 and 2020. To be unified.
3- In the abstract, the number of samples is 211, but in the text of the article, 214 are mentioned. Correct sentences.
4- Blood agar should be written in the material and method section of line 5.
5- When writing the names of the bacteria, write the full name of the bacteria for the first time. Like Escherichia coli or Staphylococcus.
6- Table 1 and Table 2 lists Morganella organelle, which is incorrect and should be changed to Morganella morganii.
7- The results presented in this paper are very poor and limited to antibiograms. It would have been better to use molecular techniques to diagnose and evaluate the epidemiology of bacteria.
8- The results presented in the form of an antibiogram along with the MIC could complement the results of the paper, so the lack of information about the MIC as a deficiency in the article.
9- The information presented in the results and discussion of the article is not very new and the article is very weak in terms of information innovation.
10- There are grammatical errors in the article that need to be reconsidered.
Thanks

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 30 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author.
According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 30 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The response letter

To the Editor of Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies

Dear Editor,
Submission of revised paper **(**Manuscript ID103529**)**
Thank you for your email dated 30 April 2020 containing the reviewer comments.
We are pleased to resubmit to you our manuscript (**Bacterial Strains and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Patterns in Male Urinary Tract Infections in Duhok Province, Iraq)**

We found that the reviewer comments of our initial paper submission to be very helpful. In responding to their comments, we considered that our manuscript is greatly strengthened.

We have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. Our responses are given in a point-by -point manner below. Changes to the manuscript are **highlighted** in **red color.**

Response to reviewer 1:

1. In the abstract: the number of clones is 105 cfu/ml.
   Thanks for your comment. The number of clones is 10^5 cfu/ml. The changes are highlighted in red.
2. It is said that the samples were collected between 2018 and 2020, but in the materials and methods section, it was collected between 2017 and 2020. To be unified.
   Thanks for this and we are sorry for the typo error, the samples were collected between 2017 and 2020

3. In the abstract, the number of samples is 211, but in the text of the article, 214 are mentioned. Correct sentences.
   Thanks for this and we are sorry for the typo error, the number of samples were 211

4. Blood agar should be written in the material and method section of line 5.
   Thanks for your comment. Then, the urine samples were inoculated on Blood agars and MacConkey agars (Oxoid Ltd, Bashingstore, Hampire, UK),

5. When writing the names of the bacteria, write the full name of the bacteria for the first time. Like Escherichia coli or Staphylococcus.
   Thanks for your comment. The required changes have been made.

6. Table 1 and Table 2 lists Morganella organelle, which is incorrect and should be changed to Morganella morganii. **Thanks for your comment. Corrected Morganella organelle into Morganella morganii through the whole text**
7. The results presented in this paper are very poor and limited to antibiograms. It would have been better to use molecular techniques to diagnose and evaluate the epidemiology of bacteria.
   Thanks for your comment. We agree with you, this is one of the limitations of our study (already mentioned in discussion). Therefore, further studies should be conducted in the area using a molecular technique to diagnose and evaluate the sensitivity of bacteria to overcome this limitation

8. The information presented in the results and discussion of the article is not very new and the article is very weak in terms of information innovation.
   Thanks for your comment. We agree that the information presented in our study is not too new. However, our planning to do the same projects using more advance techniques to detect the antimicrobial sensitivity in the near futures.

9. There are grammatical errors in the article that need to be reconsidered
   Thanks for this. The article has been revised by English editor. The changes are highlighted in red.

Response to *general editorial concerns:*

Thanks for your comments. Th manuscript has been revised and the required changes has been made. The Changes are highlighted in red color.

In the Abstract:

1. Reporting all interventions and instruments used in the study.
   Thanks for this. The biochemical characteristics of the isolated bacteria and their susceptibility to different antibiotics was identified by the Vitek-2 microbial compact machine.

2. Reporting important findings of the study in the “Results” section including mean changes (SD) and exact P values (for example; P=0023, instead of P<0.005).

Thanks for your comment. We have only calculated the frequency and percentage (%) of sensitivity

3. The conclusion should be written according to the “Objective” of the study.
The changes have been made. E. coli isolates were the most frequent pathogens causing UTI in male, followed by P. aeruginosa and Staphylococcus spp. The vast majority of isolates were resistant to commonly prescribed antibiotics such as ampicillin, ceftriaxone, cefepime, benzylpenicillin, oxacillin and erythromycin

4. Keywords should be chosen by using MeSH
Thanks for this. Keywords have been chosen by MeSH

In the main text;

1) Every used abbreviation should be defined at the first time of use.
Thanks for your comments: All required changes have been done through the whole text

2) Report and state the approval of the Local Ethics Committee on the study in the “Methods” section.
Thanks for this. The present study was approved by the ethic committee of the College of Medicine, University of Zakho, Kurdistan, Iraq (Reference number 4/154/NW/ 02.05.2019).

3) Report the process of the Singing consent form for all participants in the text.
Thank you for your comment. Consent was obtained from all participants recruited in this study before samples collection.

5) Always use the maximum of two decimal places for presenting data, for example, “21.36” instead of “21.357”. **Thanks for this. The required changes have been made through text**

6) Always present error line (SD or SEM), when presenting data by the bar or line graphs.
Think you for your comment. Our data was only presented and reported in frequency and percentage.

7) Do NOT repeat reporting data in both table and graph formats.
The article has revised and changes have been made as highlighted in red colour in the text

8) All used abbreviations in tables should be defined in the legend of tables.

The requested changes have been made as highlighted in red colour below the tables.

9) All numbers and data should be written in English format, for example; “3.44” instead of “3/44”.
All number and data have revised and written in English format. Thanks

10) Report on the limitations of the study and discuss how those limitations may affect the results.
Thanks for your comment. **The limitation of the present study was that a smaller number of samples (211 samples) were recruited. Secondly, the study was conducted mainly in male gender and age less than 10 years not analysed in the study. Therefore, further studies using a molecular technique to diagnose and evaluate the sensitivity of bacteria should be conducted in the region to overcome these limitations.**

Note: All other requested changes (like references, %, English language…etc) have been made accordingly in the text

We hope that the manuscript is now suitable for publication and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Ibrahim A. Naqid
PhD in Molecular Microbiology and immunology
College of Medicine, University of Zakho, Kurdistan Region, Iraq
Mobile: 009647504737593
Email: ibrahim.naqid@uoz.edu.krd



Author's signature(s):

Date: 07.05.2020

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 28 May 2020 – 28 May 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 28 May 2020

Dear AE,
All comments have been answered and the changes made are appropriate.
Thanks

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 28 May 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewer's comments, the revised manuscript is ready for publishing.
Thanks

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 28 May 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.