



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_48687
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Bacterial and Fungal Isolates Associated with Road Traffic Accident In-Patients in General Hospitals in Niger State
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2.7, provide the reference for antibiotic sensitive testing with nutrient agar as most uses Mueller-Hinton agar. Line 156-158, the zone of inhibition for different commercial antibiotics is different. If this is not the case, provide reference. Also manage line 173. 	All necessary corrections as pointed out by the reviewer has been effected and are highlighted in yellow colour
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Do not start a sentence with numbers, manage in the result section of abstract. <i>E. coli</i> should be italicized in the results of abstract section. Line 58, delete 'between the ages' from the sentence. Line 85, remove 'and streaking' from the sentence. Line 99, try 'used for' instead of 'used were' and try 'were' for 'as follows'. Sentence between lines 109-110 seems incomplete. Manage it. Line 114, use was for is. Line 171-172, rephrase the caption of table. Line 183, use was instead of is. Line 185-187, rephrase the sentence. Line 225, use was for are in the sentence. 	All necessary corrections as pointed out by the reviewer has been effected and are highlighted in yellow colour
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are no ethical issues regarding this work