



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49339
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antimicrobial Resistance of Neisseria Gonorrhoeae isolated from adults aged 18 years and above presenting with urethral and vaginal discharges at Mbarara Regional Referral Hospital</b>
Type of the 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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Merely repeated the title, please state clear objectives</li> </ul> <p><b>Study design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please separate – 'jar, then</li> <li>Include the type of sample – urethral and endocervical swab</li> <li>Key words should be in italics</li> </ul> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested bracket for references is [ ] instead of ( )</li> <li>Separate these sentences - (Tapsall et al., 2009). For the past 70-80 years</li> <li>becoming significant – 'significantly becoming is preferred'</li> <li>extended spectrum cephalosporins (ESCs), cefixime and ceftriaxone – insert colon after cephalosporins (ESCs)</li> </ul> <p><b>METHODS</b></p> <p><b>Study design, setting and population</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study design was mentioned in the abstract but completely excluded in the methodology</li> <li>Include the type of study and duration ( as in the abstract), but it should be elaborate</li> </ul> <p><b>Data collection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include the procedure for swab collection for standardization, especially the endocervical swab</li> </ul>	



	<p><b><u>Laboratory procedure</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The statement below should be under data collection: Two swabs were collected one for Gram stain and the other for culture and sensitivity from both male and female clients from endocervical canal for females and urethra for males.</li><li>• Separate the statement below: Stuart media. The swab for – please separate</li></ul> <p><b><u>RESULTS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Please include the contents of the first paragraph in your methodology, especially the number of participants and sample cultured.</li><li>• The total number of participants screened were 210 – this is not clear. Is your study on screened patients or patients presenting in hospital with urethral and vaginal discharges?</li></ul> <p><b><u>Study profile</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Two swabs were taken off from 189 participants, then N=378. This is not clear. Besides, it is not in your methodology</li><li>• In the box – no bacterial growth, - include the number and percentage</li></ul> <p><b><u>Study participants description</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The mean age should go with proper standard deviation – not 28.8 (26.5-29.7)</li><li>• Include age distribution in the table</li><li>• Marital status – total score is 187 instead of 189</li></ul> <p><b><u>Prevalence of Neisseria Gonnorrhoea</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There were 25(13.1%) clinical isolates of <i>N.gonorrhoeae</i> – this does not tally with isolated <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i>, (39%) you earlier reported</li></ul> <p><b><u>Characteristics of participants who had Neisseria Gonnorrhoea</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The mean age should be go with standard deviation</li></ul> <p><b><u>DISCUSSION</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a high frequency rate (13%) of gonococcal infection – remove frequency</li><li>• Afrasiabiet <i>al.</i> – should be Afrasiabi <i>et al.</i></li></ul> <p><b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In your methodology, your study was not on adult's age 18 years and above. Your data was collected from participants who presented with urethral and vaginal discharges from the specified clinics. This could include 17 years and below. You need to include it in the methodology.</li></ul> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Good but in my opinion, Vancouver method is preferable</li></ul>	
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Ikobho Ebenezer Howells</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Niger Delta University Teaching Hospital, Nigeria</i></b>