



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_48505
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY PATTERN OF STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS ISOLATED FROM CLINICAL SAMPLES IN SPECIALIST HOSPITAL, SOKOTO
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>A. Line 19-22: Revise to mean that 40% of the <i>S. aureus</i> isolates were susceptible to Clindamycin, 64% to Ciprofloxacin... The way it is stated in the manuscript (Ms), it sounds as if the authors tested 40% of Clindamycin ... against the isolates. This does not make sense</p> <p>B. Line 61-65: Clarify if the primary isolates were from routine diagnostic work up from where the authors collected them for their research. As it is stated that the isolates were collected on agar slant, it is not quite clear.</p> <p>C. Line 143: It is not the antibiotic that had the resistance but the pathogen that exhibited resistance to the antibiotic. Revise this accordingly</p> <p>D. Table 5: Check the values for Clindamycin: 23 +44 = 67. MRSA isolates were 66.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 6 insert "antibiotic" susceptibility</p> <p>Line 10 insert (.)</p> <p>Line 11 delete "pathogenic"</p> <p>Line 13 testing</p> <p>Line 16 Subjects</p> <p>Line 24 "It is believed...these antibiotics should be used": Authors should only report their findings without recommending the antibiotics to use. This decision should be left to the clinicians who can use the susceptibility data with other clinical features to make a decision.</p> <p>L 33 g to G, coccus for cocci</p> <p>L37 cause not causes</p> <p>L50 delete "different", insert in after increase</p> <p>L59 Use of a single phrase to describe the study design is not adequate, looks too elementary. Make at least a full sentence.</p> <p>L105 insert s</p> <p>L109 delete: "it was observed</p> <p>L156 Replace with "difference"</p> <p>L167 No high level of resistance is evident from the data presented. So you cannot discuss your results in terms of high level of resistance.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>L68 Gram's staining technique and other biochemical tests described here are routine commonplace microbiological procedures. There is no need to describe them in details. A good citation will suffice.</p> <p>L26: Conclusion: Conclusion should not be recommendation but an emphasis of what the results show e.g The study has shown that <i>S. aureus</i> isolates were moderately sensitive to the antibiotics tested etc.</p> <p>The authors in cooperation with the copy editor of the journal may wish to improve the general language and style of this manuscript. It sounds elementary somehow.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel O. Ekundayo
Department, University & Country	Nigeria