



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_46061
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacteriological and Molecular study of Aminoglycoside resistance among klebsiella pneumoniae strains isolated from urinary tract infections in pediatric cases in Egypt
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology is good to publish but not so sufficient to evaluate identify aminoglycoside resistance among <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> strains isolated from cases of urinary tract infections in pediatrics and to evaluate the presence of 16S rRNA methylase genes including <i>armA</i> and <i>rmtB</i> genes in the isolated strains. Methodology is good to publish. But part of detection virulence factors contains two virulence factors assays. More virulence factors assays can be added. Results of virulence factors can be added as Figures or Tables. Title of manuscript can be changed. But it is not bad at all. Data of this paper is present (molecular study and phenotypic tests). First part of study can be improved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To study more parameters in molecular section and virulence factors the cost will be high and we had not any financial support from our institution Virulence factors (haemolysin) explained in table 3 Title had been changed as suggested from the reviewers
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript language does not look like so bad at all, but it could be even better. The whole manuscript should be copyedited. English editing should be done. Showing references is so bad in manuscript. (<i>etc. Munkhdelger et al, 2017</i>) (20, 19)) They should be changed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language had been somewhat improved
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript reports interesting and insightful work. However, there are number of grammatical and editing errors. Based on its scientific merit, I can most kindly recommend your paper to be published after improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar errors corrected as possible

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	