



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRRU_43989</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antibiotic Susceptibility Profile of Klebsiella Species Isolated from Pregnant Women Attending Selected Medical Centre in Northern Nigeria</b>
New Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antibiotic Susceptibility Profile of Klebsiella Species Isolated from Pregnant Women with Dysuria Attending Selected Medical Centre in Northern Nigeria</b>
Type of Article:	<b>Original Research Articles</b>

**PART 2:**

<b>FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)</b>	<b>Authors' response to final evaluator's comments</b>
<p>I have reviewed the changes made in response to my suggestions. The changes do not address my concerns fully.</p> <p>Sample size: 5 strains is not enough strains to attain statistical certainty in the prediction of susceptibility trends.</p> <p>Patient selection: I am concerned that the authors have suddenly changed the patient selection criteria after the study is completed, based on my suggestion, from asymptomatic to symptomatic. In most countries, asymptomatic pregnant women (not symptomatic women) are screened for asymptomatic bacteriuria, so I question what was actually done in screening the patients for this study.</p> <p>The authors have not provided number of patients screened, number of patients refusing consent, or number of patients excluded. This is a required component of study reporting for all observational studies.</p> <p>Methods: the authors have changed the study methods based on my suggestions. I question what method was actually used in the study.</p>	<p><b>The number of isolates subjected to the antimicrobial susceptibility testing is the total number of characterized klebsiella species isolated at the study site from the study subjects during the study period. So, the antimicrobial trend is based on the number of klebsiella species isolated in the study.</b></p> <p><b>The idea for patients' inclusion and exclusion criteria was conceived since during the study. Therefore, the previous review suggested insertion of the criteria in the manuscript. The suggestion was accepted and included in the revised manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>All the fifty (mentioned in the manuscript) consented patients enrolled in the study agreed and volunteered to participate in the study considering the importance of the study in the antenatal patients. Consent form was given and verbally explained to each of the participants by the study researcher. Rapid pregnancy test was used to screen for the pregnancy status of each participant who reported dysuria to the study site. Non-pregnant women were excluded from participation in the study.</b></p> <p><b>The original methods used in the study were not changed. Two types of media were used for the isolation of the bacteria. The second medium (CLED) that was not mentioned in the original manuscript was included in the revised version of the manuscript following suggestions by one of the reviewers.</b></p>