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Reviewer's report:

I have seen your manuscript in detail and I find a number of problems. The level of language was not suitable for publication, it needs revision. Please find my comment in each section below

Concerning the title

The title says "High prevalence of…." but in fact the study design used cannot permit to study prevalence. The title needs modification

Concerning the abstract

Background:

* Context and purpose of the study were not explained.

* The second sentence (line 41 of page 3) says "Sexual transmission of MDRGN might represent a mode which has not been noticed so far." It is not clear what the author want to say. If we take as it is, this study is not basic research that exhibiting us a unique route of transmission.

* Multidrug-resistant microorganisms in addition to multidrug-resistant gram-negative organisms (MDRGN) have the same route of transmission with drug sensitive organisms within the same species. Nothing is unique for this organism except some virulent factors that help the for drug resistance.

Methods

* Statistical test used was not stated.

* It didn't give us enough information how the study was conducted except study units.
Results

* The result didn't show us about sexual route of transmission which is not consistent with the other part of the abstract. Rectal swab solely do not show us whether the organisms were from genitalia or gastrointestinal route (GIT).

Conclusion

* The conclusion was not supported by the result and study design of the study. The results indicate the presence of high number of multidrug resistant *Escherichia coli*. But nothing is stated about sexual transmission. Furthermore *E. coli* is not known sexually transmitted pathogen (It is know faco-oral route transmission). The most probable source of these organisms is gastrointestinal source because they took rectal swab.

Comment concerning background of the study

* The context of the study was not stated

* Nothing is said about the gaps, the purpose and the aim of the study

Methods

* Nothing is said about design of the study and the setting.

* The type of analysis used was not well stated.

* One subtitle under methods was "Definition of multidrug resistant gram-negative organisms (MDRGN)" the definition of MDRGN organism should be under background of the study.

* There was subtitle which say "Screening for MDRGN and testing for HIV" but nothing is explained about screening for MDRGN and testing for HIV methods

* The methodology part was generally not well explained. The study was retrospective as indicated but the methodology was not indicated in such away.

Result

* The way authors present the result was not suitable for publication.
* Table used including its title needs major revision

* Figure one is not needed because the authors already indicated the magnitude of MDRGN by text. The authors should use illustration for a thing that is difficult to summarize by text.

Discussion

* I was not convinced that the literature quoted and compared to this study were a fair comparison

Conclusion

* Please see comment given under conclusion section of the abstract above.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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