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Reviewer's report:

1. Page 7, line 10/11: Klebsiella pneumoniae should be replaced with Salmonella spp (Klebsiella pneumoniae had already been included in the list in line 8)
2. Page 7, line 26: "sexually transmitted disease samples" should be unbundled. How many urethral swabs, endocervical swabs, high vaginal swabs or genital ulcer specimens?
3. Page 7, line 36: "ear, nose and throat specimens" should be unbundled. How many ear swab, throat swab etc?
4. Page 7, line 38/39: Provide information on the how the bacteria were identified. What antibiotic susceptibility testing method was deployed?
5. Page 7, line 43/44: The phrase "Extended Spectrum Beta Lactamase-production" should be deleted, it not part of the tested antibiotics but rather confirmatory test for resistant GNB strains.
6. Page 8, line 14/16: From your draft: "We sought permission and ethical clearance to carry out the study from the private laboratory and Health Studies office in the Ministry of Health Institutional review board". Was approval to proceed with the study obtained from MOH Institutional review board? If yes provide evidence to that effect. Was ethical clearance not required for this study? If yes provide objective evidence.
7. Page 22, Table 1: You established that 23432 bacteria pathogens were from 23432 specimens. The impression is that each specimen yielded one isolate. Were there no polymicrobial culture that yielded two or more of your priority organisms (especially from wound specimens, ear, nose and throat specimens etc)?

Clarification is required on this.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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