SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_41534**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Antibacterial activity of some nano particles on antibiotic resistant bacterial pathogens from air of operation theatre**
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	English editing is certainly needed for the entire manuscript. Some sentences can be combined in the manuscript. For instance, in lines 6-7, "Three pathogenic bacterial strains were isolated. These strains were named as A1, A2, A3." Those sentences could have been combined. In line 6, location (country) of Mayo hospital should be provided. In line 15, statement of "Optimum temperature was 37ºC while the optimum pH was 7." should be clarified to explain which bacterial isolate has those optimum values. In lines 48-49, It was stated that "The temperature range was 25ºC, 30ºC, 37ºC and 40ºC. Instead of this sentence, suggested sentence can be "Optimum growth was studied at four different temperatures, 25ºC, 30ºC, 37ºC and 40ºC." It is not clear whether a range of temperature or selected temperatures were studied. No information was provided for evaluation of disc diffusion zones. Which criteria i.e. CLSI or EUCAST was used. This information should be included. Related to this comment, instead of reporting the susceptibilities of isolates only as"R" in Tables 1. Both inhibition zone sizes and interpretation results either S or R should be given. Also, In Table 2, zone sizes of methanol (control) should be given. In lines 69-71, "a drop of autoclaved water was poured in the center of the plate on which bacterial isolate was inoculated and it was then evenly spread on the entire plate with the help of sterilized spreader." From this statement, it is not clear that the amount of bacterial suspension which was used in the assay. It should be clarified. In lines 80-81, "PCR was done using universal primers; 27f and 1495r." Either reference or sequence of the primers should be provided. Results should be reorganized and Figures related to results should be indicated in the text. Discussion part of manuscript was written weekly and contains many typing error. This part should definitely be strengthened. Many references is missing in the References part. References should be checked carefully and were given according to requirement of the JPRI.	
Minor REVISION comments	In lines 65-69, The medium used was nutrient agar; it was prepared by dissolving 28 grams of prepared nutrient agar in 1 liter (1000ml) of distilled water in a flask. The pH of the medium was maintained at 7.4, the medium was sterilized by autoclaving for 20 minutes at 121^{o}C temperature and 15 Ib pressure. After medium was autoclaved, it was poured in the petri plates under sterile conditions. Details of the preparation of agar were not needed, therefore it can be removed. Also, why nutrient agar instead of Mueller-Hinton Agar was used in antibiotic susceptibility testing should be explained.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Emel Banu Buyukunal***
Department, University & Country	***Kahramanmaras Sutcu Imam University, Turkey***