1) Overview: what kind of article is this?
   a. Research article
      i. What kind of research?
         1. Meta-analysis
         2. Cross-sectional
         3. Longitudinal
   b. Editorial/commentary
   c. Review
   d. What were the major findings?

2) Abstract
   a. Does the abstract accurately summarize the article?
      i. Yes, for the most part, but the abstract conclusion and the text conclusion don’t really line up.

3) Introduction
   a. Is the review of relevant literature prepared adequately and is it properly sourced?
      i. A comprehensive background of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is given to introduce the reader to the most commonly seen clones of this bacterium.
      ii. While the introduction gives a comprehensive background of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, it does not give any background or description of CF. I think it should since the CF status of the patient is key to the pathogenicity of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.
      iii. The results talk about the mutational status of the CF patients. I think the introduction should have not only talked about the clones of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, but also about Cystic Fibrosis as a disease and what the different mutations of Cystic Fibrosis mean.
   b. Is the research question clear and does it respond to a gap in the literature?
      i. Yes, they are trying to establish a prevalent clone due to possible patient-to-patient transmission and its association to specific phenotypic traits.

4) Methods
   a. Is the sampling strategy reasonable and sound?
      i. While the sampling strategy appears to be reasonable, the explanation of it isn’t good. The authors waited until the results section to define “chronically colonized” versus “intermittently colonized” even though these terms were used in the methods section.
   b. Is the statistical analytic plan rigorous and sound?
      i. No, they don’t talk about a statistical analytic plan.
5) Results
   a. Are the results presented clearly and comprehensively?
      i. The written description of how the different isolates relate to one another was pretty clear, but I wanted to see a visual with the isolates labelled showing how related or unrelated they were.
   b. Do the results cohere to the research question?
      i. Yes, but they are lacking any kind of statistical analysis. It uses words like “a few” which is vague and they need to substantiate their general conclusions with statistical analyses.
   c. Do the results presented cohere to the Tables and Figures?
      i. Yes
   d. Are the Tables and Figures clear and precise? Do they respond to the research question?
      i. Figure 1 is clear and easy to read. It is easy to see which isolates were the most common and which were the least common.
      ii. Figure 2 was not clear to me. It is way too busy with tiny print to be reader-friendly. They should have broken the figure into parts (A, B, C, D) at the very least because I don’t have any idea which part of the figure the legend is referring to for the most part. I don’t think including all of that information as a able is useful or necessary. I think the space would have been better used with a bigger visual of how the different isolates are related or unrelated to one another.
      iii. Tables 1 and 2 are clear and easy to read.
      iv. Figure 3 is understandable, but I think the same information could be presented in a more clear way.

6) Discussion/conclusion
   a. Does this article add to the existing literature?
      i. It adds to existing literature in the sense of showing what benefits there are to surveillance programs, but it doesn’t add much to existing literature regarding prevalence of patient-to-patient transmission and phenotypes of Pseudomonas aeruginosa clones.
   b. Do the discussion points appropriately contextualize the findings (do they speak to the data presented in the results)?
      i. They finally threw in some percentages in the discussion section, but I think they belong in the results section.
      ii. They say pretty early in the discussion that the risk of cross-colonization is low which also should go into the results section with some statistical evidence to back that claim up.
   c. Are the implications for public health presented beyond “future research is needed”?
      i. Not really, it doesn’t make a clear statement regarding person-to-person transmission and they have a lot of limitations preventing them from even attempting to form a clear conclusion.
d. What is the overall recommendation for this manuscript?
   i. Accept as is
   ii. Provisional acceptance (some minor changes required)
   iii. Minor revision (needs to be re-reviewed after suggested changes are made)
   iv. Major revision
   v. Reject, but encourage resubmission
   vi. Reject