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Reviewer's report:

As an individual who worries about quality of scientific paper, comment I gave you were fair, very clear, precise, and to the point with simple English. You have said "do not understand" in response to most of the comment. I think one important role of peer review is pointing a place where correction and clarification is needed. If there is any doubt in any point of view the authors asked to justify their point of view. As I understand the aim of reviewing is not to discourage or other rather for the better of the scientific information. Most of your responses were do not understand and disagree, so let me try to clarify my point in respective of number of your response.

1. Your study assesses the magnitude of MDRGN among…. See what criteria should be fulfilled to study prevalence (Study design, sampling method, sample size, representativeness, and target population).

2. Your background is mainly focused on sexually transmitted diseases and in most part of the manuscript you presented as detected MDRGN were acquired through sexual root. Do you think that your study tell us the root of transmission of MDRGN??? I am sorry re-writing the same thing in manuscript. It cannot be critical response for my comment. I have seen what you write so far because of that I comment you. In addition, what you stated under background was not in line with your study objective. For instant: You were discussion about HIV, Syphilis, and Human Herpes Virus which is not related to your study…..

3. Your study was conducted on collected the sample from rectum which is the part of GIT. Any organism came from upper GIT can contact this area, so how could you discriminate this from organism transmitted during sexual intercourse. Since your controls were HIV negative, the low magnitude in control group was as a result of intact immunity system may not due to absence sexual intercourse. This is my point.

➢ To study the type of study you are try to explain, your control shouldn't be HIV negative male. You consider only the equivalent age of the participants, but there is a significant difference between HIV positive and HIV negative individuals, the so called "Immunity". Therefore, it is clear that the difference between two group is the ability to defend the infectious diseases. What you are discussing as a major concept may be insignificant because the main difference between both groups is immunity. To evaluate the sexual transmission of
the MDRGN, the medical condition of your study group should be the same (Both control and the study participant should be HIV positive). Then the difference between study group and control group would be their sexual habit (your study participants would be homosexual while your controls is non homosexual) but both group should be the same in terms of HIV status.

➢ The other important thing is nothing is described as those HIV positive patients were homosexual or not. As I anticipated you consider all HIV positive males as homosexuals, if so it is the big mistake. If not you have to tell us as the study was carried out on homosexual male patient and how you identify it from the recorded.

4. I also try to see what you refer and it cannot answer my point. I am sorry again you didn't give me important justification.

5. Please here what you have to understand is here I am commenting abstract you have to see the title of my comment!! Is there any mentioned statistical test in this "Methods: Between January 2015 and March 2016, we retrospectively investigated the prevalence of MDRGN in rectal swabs of n=109 males serologically tested positive for HIV (HP). These findings were compared to the prevalence of MDRGN in n=109 rectal swabs collected from age-matched males tested negative for HIV (HN) within the same period." which was your previous method.

6. I am saying that the above quoted the so called method was only stated study unit (Refer what information should be included under method)

7. Still this comment was very clear. By examining rectal swab, it is impossible to say observed organisms were from sexual contact. Your result simply showed us as a number of gram negative organisms were detected from rectal swab which doesn't showed us the root of transmission (Whether it is sexual transmission or feco-oral transmission). Your background of the study and your conclusion were mainly focused on sexual transmission of those organisms, which cannot be answered by this study. Because of this I said it was not consistent.

8. I am not saying that E. coli may not transmitted by sexual root but I said, E. coli is not known sexually transmitted pathogen as compared to feco-oral transmission. Just even refer your own background of the study which says "E. coli O117:H7 (normally feco-oral transmission route) [16]...." Sorry again you couldn't give me important justification for my comment rather you are focusing on minor things and you are not interested to correct.

9. I am sorry, it is correct. Your previous background of study contains two paragraphs (From line 60-80 of page 4 of previous manuscript). The first one mainly characterizes multidrug-
resistant gram-negative organisms and something about ways of transmission. Then the second paragraph emphasis on root of transmission. So my comment was fair and correct. Even as commented above how could you discuss about root of transmission on things that you are not sure. As I comment you above, your study was retrospective that show only magnitude of multidrug-resistant gram-negative organisms among HIV positive men and you used HIV negative men as control.

10. I am sorry for your response. Can you tell me any sentence that clearly explain about the gaps, the purpose and the aim of the study in your previous background of the study (From line 60-80 of page 4 of previous manuscript). Again you count gave me important justification and you are not interested to correct.

11. What you mention in your response was stated under "patient and specimen" sub-title of your manuscript. But you didn't say anything in the other part while it is expected as you have to show your study design, type of analysis used clearly even in separate sub-title.

14. What I am saying is under "Screening for MDRGN and testing for HIV" you said "According to German infection protection law ("Infektionsschutzgesetz") it is mandatory for hospitals to execute documented infection control strategies to prevent the transmission of infective agents and protect patient health. At University Hospital Frankfurt, Germany (UHF), this demand is fulfilled by a so called "hygiene plan". In accordance to the hygiene plan, all patients arriving from hospitals in HPC for MDRGN (and/or methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus) or patients admitted to intensive/intermediate care units (ICU/IMC) are screened for MDRGN on day of admittance….." and this can be used to describe the setup of your Laboratory, but not related to the so called "Screening for MDRGN and testing for HIV" sub-title. I have seen as you describe the method in other section.

In general, I can't give you other comments after modification because you didn't accept my previous comment and you didn't give me a critical justification on my previous comment. Your responses were also says "do not understand and disagree" so what I have to do is explaining my previous comment and justifying my point.
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