



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_17483
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacterial and drug susceptibility profiles of urinary tract infection in Diabetes Mellitus patients at Mbarara Regional Referral Hospital, Uganda
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		
Minor REVISION comments	Observations Abstract - Abstract should be written as it's indicated by journal guidelines. For example introduction should be replaced by "aim" and the whole followed sentence in line 9 to line 12 should be removed "The risk of developing infection in diabetic mellitus patients is known to be higher than in normal individuals. The urinary tract is the most common entry point for infections. Surveillance of urinary tract pathogens and their antibiogram is key to patient management." - In line 17, authors say that "A total of 105 asymptomatic patients" were subject of the present study but in the title I read that "Diabetes Mellitus patients" were subject of the study. Thus, my question is: there were asymptomatic patients or Diabetes Mellitus patients? Please clarify this point as you did in line 124 (result section). - In line 27, I suggest to change this following sentence from "The isolation of bacterial pathogens that are resistant..." to "The isolation of bacterial pathogens which resist.."	Has been addressed Has been clarified as requested Has been changed as advised



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Introduction - In the whole manuscript, authors should write citations in numbers between brackets. - In line 42, add a space between “comma” and “and”. - Avoid long sentence. For example in line 43, I suggest to add a dot after the word “individuals”, remove “and”, then add “Urinary tract is the most common site for infection”. - Change “impairs” to “impair” in line 49. - Add “it” after “is a major” in line 55. Result - Add “was” after “ranged” in line 125. - Add “age” after “a mean “ in line 125. - In line 135 (title of table 1), authors say that bacteria were isolated from pregnant women (N =14), but I, the text (line 130) the mentioned number of women is 9 and not 14. Authors should clarify that point. Prevalence was 13.3 which mean number of patients (men and women) with UTI is 14. Discussion Change “this may not compare well with” to “this may not be well compared with”. References - The writing way of references is very heterogeneous. Please check the journal guidelines. - Both citations “Ghulam 2011” and “Ramana et al” are not present (cited) in the manuscript.	Has been addressed as advised Has been addressed as advised Has been changed as advised Has been added as advised Has been added as advised Has been added as advised Has been addressed as requested Has been addressed Has been attended to
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Add statistical tests.	