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)

	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	**The following observations were made for possible corrections;** **TITLE** ➢ The TITLE should be rephrase to read: "**Phenotypic study on some virulence factors and molecular screening of aminoglycoside resistance among *Klebsiella pneumoniae* strains isolated from urinary tract infections in pediatric cases in Egypt".** ➢ The '**K**' in *Klebsiella pneumoniae* should be in block letter as reflected in the **title** and **conclusion** of the **abstract** and also in the main **result**. **MATERIALS AND METHODS** ➢ Detection of biofilm producers: delete '.......for *Klebsiella pneumoniae*' in the first sentence. ➢ *Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion method*: delete 2016 after CLSI in citation number 12. This is applicable to other areas in the text where such citation was used. ➢ The last sentence; ".....were stored at -70°C in brain heart infusion ....? Is it infusion agar or broth? **RESULTS:** ➢ Group 1 and 2, Table 1-7 in the text should NOT be bold **DISCUSSION:** ➢ **The 3rd paragraph** "*In this cross-sectional study, rates of resistance on 98 isolates of K. pneumoniae to ampicillin, cefazolin, Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole, Amoxicillin/clavulanic, ceftriaxone, cefotaxime, Cefoxitin, Ceftazidime, and Cefepime were 100%, 100%, 88.7%, 75.5%, 79.6%, 74.49%, 64.3%, 64.3%,and 62.24% respectively*" **is repetition of results. Delete!** ➢ Hemolysin and biofilm production was not discussed at all, why? **CITATIONS:** ➢ As earlier observed, most of the citations in the text were wrongly applied. For example consider the 6th paragragh of DISCUSSION; "In the current study, the resistance rate of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases is considerably higher than previous studies in Tehran performed by *Maleki et al, 2017* and in Mongolia performed by *Munkhdelger et al, 2017 (18,19)*". This sentence can be rephrase thus; "***In the current study, the resistance rate of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases is considerably higher than previous studies in Tehran [18] and Mongolia [19]***". ➢ All citation numbers MUST be in square brackets [ ] and NOT ( ). ➢ Review all the citations in the text to match the requirement of the journal. **REFERENCES:** ➢ Format all the references according to the journal requirement. See author's guidelines for detail.	

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Musa Yakubu Tula*
Department, University & Country	*Federal Polytechnic Mubi, Nigeria*