



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_48293
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the efficacy of flow cytometry in detecting bacterial contamination in platelets
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Some comments required for this manuscript to be published</p> <p>1 - Name scientific in Italian. 2 - Correct abbreviations of scientific names after second appearance in the text. 3 - ML, the correct one is mL 4 - The abbreviations when they appear for the first time, should be described. 5 - Works with bacteria but cites HIV and hepatitis, which are viruses. 6 - Epidemiological data from 2007, 11 years ago. Authors should update this data. 7 - Why the authors did not evaluate possibilities of contaminated bags and did not carry out the contamination? 8 - Some sentences are redundant (see first paragraph of the introduction). 9 - Did not mention which cytometer was used 10 - origin of the reagents used in the labeling. 11 - Describe any detailed methodology or reference where you have withdrawn the knowledge to do this marking. 12 - In the tables and figures lacked legend and description. They must be self-explanatory. 13 - In the text, the number of references used are not in order, including some nor were cited in the text, as references 3, 4, 10, 12, and 17. 14 - Discussion: There are no references in the text. 15 - I did not observe conflicting or concordant data being discussed together with the results obtained. 16 - Introduction needs to be more emphatic about the problem of infections. Because this type of experiment is important. Why did you use the bacteria and did not check the pockets of blood? 17 - It was not mentioned whether they are ATCC strains or what their origin.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>I believe to be a work of great relevance, however have some reservations about the article to be published. Initially, English should be reviewed. As for the text itself, I think the authors should describe it in more depth. Everything was written with a lot of superficiality, mainly regarding the methodology and discussion of the results. I also think that there has been a lack of a description of the abbreviations, scientific names in italics, abbreviations of scientific names, capital letters and small letters, as well as a revision of the numbering as well as the references in the text.</p> <p>Therefore, I believe that a complex review is necessary before it is published.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tania Mara Pinto Dabés Guimarães</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil</i>