



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_45466
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Staphylococcus aureus Small Colony Variant (SCV) Clinical Isolates from Ahmadu Bello University Teaching Hospital, Zaria
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"> 1. There is a need of more clarification on this section...I see no reason of carrying out catalase and coagulase test as long as you used MSA. This is because MSA is a selective as well as differential media, Coagulase positive most likely <i>S. aureus</i> ferments Mannitol sugar in the media turning it into yellow coloration while CoNS species doesn't as such retains the color of the media as pink....unless if you are interested in isolating CoNS, as <i>Micrococcus luteus</i> sometimes bring confusion in identifying CoNS on MSA. 2. Did you cross check the total volume of your master mix? You need to differentiate between volume (μL) and concentration (Mm) because they are two different things, but you seems to consider them as one thing.....so please put the volume as well as the concentration of each component of the reaction mixture 3. Data analysis is missing 4. I didn't see the gel picture of any representative amplicons of the samples analyzed using PCR....you need to present it under results section otherwise the molecular part of the work is questionable. 	Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers.
Minor REVISION comments	Find the minor corrections in the document as track changes	
Optional/General comments	I think the work is okay, and it bears a novelty to some extent. As long as the author attended to the corrections made, especially molecular part then the manuscript could be published	

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)	