



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48582
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF GBS SEROTYPES ASSOCIATED WITH ANOGENITAL COLONIZATION AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN IN JOS
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	TITLE and ABSTRACT needs a mayor revision as I suggest PREVALENCE OF GBSStreptococcus Agalactiae SEROTYPES ASSOCIATED WITH ANOGENITAL COLONIZATION AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN IN JOS ABSTRACT Aim The aim of this study was to determine the prevalence of GBS serotype distribution in Jos University Teaching Hospital. Materials and Methodology This was a hospital based descriptive cross-sectional study of 300 women receiving health care at the Jos University Teaching Hospital between July 2017 and November 2017. Systematic sampling technique was employed in recruiting consenting subjects for this study. High vaginal and anorectal swabs were collected from each subject after obtaining their consent by signing a structured consent form. The identifiedStreptococcus Agalactiae (GBS) isolates were serotyped using immuLex strep-B antisera from SSI Diagnostica, 2 Herredysvejen, DK-3400 Hillerod Demnark to identify the different serotypes. The results obtained were computed using SPSS version 21. Results A total of 300 women obtaining health care in Jos University Teaching Hospital (JUTH) were enrolled in this study between the months of July, 2017 and November, 2017. In all, vaginal and anorectal swabs were taken from 200 pregnant women and 100 non-pregnant women. The age range of the study population was between 16 years to 48 years with a mean age of 31.9 year (SD ± 6.6). The prevalence rate among the study population was 6.3%. The colonization rate among pregnant and non-pregnant women was 6.5% and 6.0% respectively with no significant statistical difference. Serotype Ia was the commonest isolate responsible for 42.1% of the GBS isolates. Serotype III accounted for 31.6% of the isolates, followed by serotype V (15.8%). Serotype II was less common,	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	responsible for only 10.5%. Serotypes Ib, IV, VI, VII, VIII and IX were not isolated. Conclusion This study showed that GBS colonization rate among the study population was 6.3%. Approximately, 6.5% and 6.0% prevalence rate were found among pregnant and non-pregnant women respectively. Of all the GBS isolates, serotypes Ia, II, III, and serotype V were isolated with serotype Ia being the most prevalent serotype. Serotype Ib, IV, VI, VIII and IX were not isolated in this study. This knowledge of serotype distribution will help in instituting serotype specific GBS vaccines for the prevention of GBS diseases in Jos Abbreviations should not be used when a term is mentioned for the first time in the text Introduction : what does it mean EOD ? Method : how the women were recruited for GBS evaluation ? Random ? All women underwent also HIV investigation ? Results and discussion it would be very interesting and important to know the positive or negative HIV situation of women with GSB many epidemiological data presented in discussion are already been reported in introduction.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Giuseppe Gregori
Department, University & Country	Local Health Unit , Italy