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The manuscript INFD-D-19-00642 "Virulence characteristics of multidrug resistant biofilm Acinetobacter baumannii isolated from intensive care unit patients" is an interesting article about an important problem in some geographic areas to world-wide level. The authors analyze the paper of Acinetobacter baumannii in the virulence and morbi-mortality in intensive care patients, in several aspects: multiresistance, biofilm formation and related genes, integron characterization and REP-PCR molecular typing.

The approach of the work and methodology used are, from my point of view, suitable, although I consider it would be interesting to clarify some concepts:

1.- Methods:
1.a.- Bacterial isolates (page 4, line 40): They study a total of 100 A. baumannii clinical isolates from immunocompromised patients hospitalized in ICU. It does not differentiate between possible colonization in this patients. All the isolated presented association with clinic or some were considered colonization? (v.g. In the case of respiratory samples or wound swabs). All the isolated were of patients immunocompromised patients. There were no isolates of immunocompetent patients? And if it is like this…Why were not included? The previous selection of these isolated could modify the results obtained?
1.b.- Antimicrobial susceptibility testing (page 5, line 4). They have not included in the antimicrobial susceptibility assay colistina, kanamicina or tigeciclina, used for the treatment of these multiresistant infections. I think percentages of MDR and XDR would remain modified if they added these antibiotics. It would be interesting to include them if it is possible.

2.- Results:
2.1.- Antimicrobial susceptibility (page 7, line 35): ---"Fthermore, 32% of isolates were resistant to all tested antibiotics and 91% were XDR." I think that if 91% of the isolates were XDR, the "All strong forming A. baumannii isolates were XDR" or "All class I integron carrying isolates were XDR" statements are obvious. It would be necessary to try separate those sensitive isolates to the no tested
antimicrobials to evidence these affirmations.
2.b.- REP-PCR (page 8, line 46): It does’nt remain clear in the work (it would be necessary to add) the possible correlation of some clones and the greater or lower virulence in the cases analysed. Could add some data and discussion in this regard?

Formal appearances:
Page 8, Line 16-17: …"Table3. 98% of isolates…" : Write 98% in letters, no in number.
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