

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: Claudia Chaves

Submitted on: 07 Jan 2025

Article DOI: 10.3389/abp.2025.14082

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The decision to select an appropriate antibiotic for treating urinary tract infections should, among others factors, the results of microbiological tests. The results of this research, indicating higher resistance of *E. faecium* to fluoroquinolones than to aminoglycosides, are consistent with current literature reports. The authors confirm the need for careful use of fluoroquinolones in the treatment of infections caused by *E. faecium* and emphasize the importance of monitoring resistance, particularly in the context of multidrug-resistant strains. These findings emphasize the need for the restricted use of fluoroquinolones and highlight the value of fosfomycin as an effective therapeutic alternative in cases of infections caused by multidrug-resistant strains.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Any recommendations regarding the dosing of antimicrobial drugs presented in this report should be applied with great caution, taking into account local epidemiology and patterns of pathogen resistance, the clinical patient condition e the final decision from the doctor.

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 problem of antibiotic resistance in urinary tract infections treated in hospital settings is considered a Public Health Concern. The authors enfasises the problem requires a multifaceted approach, including regular resistance monitoring, responsible antibiotic use, therapy individualization, and the search for and use of alternative drugs. This research was conducted with high aquarency e precision. The methodology approach is clear and with the possibility to be replicable in others settings.

Check List

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

No answer given.

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

