

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Drug susceptibility of uropathogens isolated from patients treated at the Mazovian Specialized Hospital in Radom

Original Research, Acta Biochim. Pol.

Reviewer: Ewelina Zakrzewska

Submitted on: 04 Dec 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/abp.2025.14082

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study covers the topics of urinary tract infections and drug susceptibility of the most common uropathogens. The authors cover a well-known topic but the problem of UTI treatment is common and affects an increasing number of patients. The results presented illustrate the scale of antibiotic resistance among bacteria.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The authors of the manuscript addressed a topic present in the scientific literature and discussed by other research teams. However, the problem is important and serious enough that further studies on uropatogenic resistance will allow the collection of data to perform metanalysis.

Q 3 Please comment on the methods, results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The data used to write the manuscript were obtained with the approval of the bioethics committee. They are presented clearly and lucidly. The statistical methods used to develop the results were chosen correctly. The results were discussed fairly and in accordance with the applicable rules.

Check List

Q 4 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List)

In the case of Escherichia coli, in the discussion, the authors provided information about the prevalence of resistance to a particular antibiotic group in other centers as a percentage. To enrich the content value of the manuscript, it is recommended to provide such values for other microorganisms.

Q 5 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Q 6 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 7 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

Q 8 Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

Q 9 Are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

Yes.

Q 10 Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository? (Sequence/expression data, protein/molecule characterizations, annotations, and taxonomy data are required to be deposited in public repositories prior to publication)

Yes.

Q 11 Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?

Yes.

Q 12 Have standard biosecurity and institutional safety procedures been adhered to?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Originality



Q 14 Rigor



Q 15 Significance to the field



Q 16 Interest to general audience



Q 17 Quality of the writing



Q 18 Overall quality of the study

