

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 29851

Title: Surveillance of Australian Hajj pilgrims for carriage of potentially pathogenic bacteria: Data from two pilot studies

Reviewer's code: 00503255

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-08-30 17:13

Date reviewed: 2016-11-16 08:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors examined pharyngeal swab taken from Australian pilgrims using NAT or bacterial culture to know pharyngeal acquisition of pathogenic bacteria during or after Hajj and showed relatively high carriage of St pneumonia and little meningococcal carriage. 1. As the authors also mentioned, the authors used different methods for detecting bacteria between during and after Hajj. Two data cannot be compared directly. 2. In the discussion, the authors compared their own data to those of previous reports. Was the same method used for detecting bacteria in these reports? 3. Why was Staphylococcus aureus frequently detected Australian pilgrims after Hajj? 4. The style of some references is not appropriate for this journal. Page numbers should be described completely. For example: No. 2 "Curr Opin Pulm Med. 2013; 19:192-7." Should be changed to " Curr Opin Pulm Med. 2013; 19:192-197."

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 29851

Title: Surveillance of Australian Hajj pilgrims for carriage of potentially pathogenic bacteria: Data from two pilot studies

Reviewer's code: 00506472

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-08-30 17:13

Date reviewed: 2016-11-11 19:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting surveillance study for carriage of pathogenic bacteria, the first one among Hajj pilgrims. Few comments: 1. Page 9, results: Please explain the discordance in the number of participants between first and second phase (183 vs 93). 2. Page 9-10, results: Please provide, if available, the sensitivity to antibiotics for all pathogenic bacteria isolated. 3. Page 9-10, results: Please provide possible explanations for the lower isolation rate of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* in the second group. 4. Page 9-10, results: Please provide possible explanations regarding the fact that all *Staphylococcus Aureus* isolated strains are methicillin-sensitive. 5. Page 9-10, results: Please define if there is any correlation between age, sex or any other individual characteristic and carriage status for any pathogenic bacteria. 6. Page 10, lines 11-12, "Sixteen (17.2%) participants had taken antibiotics during Hajj; either amoxicillin, amoxicillin/clavulanic acid and/or roxithromycin". Please define how many of them have received antibiotics before sample taken. Please correlate antibiotic reception with carriage status.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 29851

Title: Surveillance of Australian Hajj pilgrims for carriage of potentially pathogenic bacteria: Data from two pilot studies

Reviewer's code: 00506525

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-08-30 17:13

Date reviewed: 2016-11-29 02:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Put at the foot of the tables the meaning of the acronyms used. 2. Mention as limitations of the study, the few strains studied and the lack of serotyping.