



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_35295
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiogram analysis and characterization of bacterial pathogens from Leucorrhoea patients
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. In the abstract you write that antibiotic resistance was analyzed by disc plate method, but the results you give as µg/ml. It is a little confusing.</p> <p>2. In the material and methods is a gap about the molecular identification of bacterial strains. You described a little steps of this analysis only in result section.</p> <p>3. In the results you describe in detail the morphological and biochemical properties of analyzed strains. I'm not sure it is necessary. The results of this study are visible in the table 1. Please decide.</p> <p>4. On what basis you estimated resistant or susceptible the bacterial strains in disk diffusion method? Did you use any recommendation (EUCAST for example?). Or maybe you marked strain as a resistant when there weren't any zone of inhibition?</p> <p>5. In my opinion the discussion is too short. You should improve this part of your manuscript and give more literature data.</p>	<p>1. Antibiotic resistance was measured by disc diffusion method while minimum inhibitory concentration of antibiotics was measured in ug/ml</p> <p>2. material added</p> <p>3.results given in table are explained in result section which in my view are quite necessary</p> <p>4.bacteria with no zone of inhibition are resistant</p> <p>5.added</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>L24: Please replace "organisms" by "bacteria".</p> <p>L40: Give the spacebar after the dot and replace "staphylococcus" by "Staphylococcus".</p> <p>L41: Use italic to write genus names of bacteria.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>L50: Give the spacebar after the dot.</p> <p>L134-135: Use the upper index.</p> <p>L165: Used antibiotics discs are as follows in table 2 not in table 1. You have to be more careful.</p> <p>L193. Give the spacebar after the dot.</p> <p>L255: Give the spacebar after the “was”.</p> <p>Table 6 and figures 3-6 present the same results. I'm not sure that the table 6 is necessary in this case. Please standardize the colour of axis.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Table explains the values and figures are given to compare.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper need to minor revision</p>	