



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_13360
Title of the Manuscript:	Frequency of MDR pseudomonas aeruginosa and extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) producer isolated from clinical sample of Khorramabad city, iran
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I read carefully your paper. This is valuable study but there are some corrections which are follows: 1. Provide structured abstract with following headings: Background, Methods, Results and Conclusions. 2. Please add definition for MDR isolates. 3. In Abstract section, result and conclusion are very poor. Please revised and completed. 4. For Keywords please Wright: Disk Diffusion Antimicrobial Tests; Pseudomonas aeruginosa; Multi drug resistant; extended-spectrum beta-lactamase 5. The clinical details of the number of each sample of clinical specimens will be required to make the study relevant and of interest. 6. Please let me know what is "CDT test". Are you means DDST (Double Disc Synergy Test to Detect ESBL)? 7. You need to define each abbreviation the first time you use it: CDT, ESBL, and 8. Please add reference for CLSI guidelines. 9. There were many wrong sentences grammatically. It should be re-write (For example: withresistance, ,.....). 10. For disks, please add µg or mg for each disks. 11. Conclusion was not complete and discussion must be compared with similar studies. 12. I think that need authors to update the references. New references can reflect that this paper	Thank you for your comments. The Abstract revised. The Abstract revised. Keywords revised. the number of each sample of clinical specimens cited in manuscript. combined disk test Abbreviation was edited. Manuscript was edited. µg or mg for each disks cited in manuscript. New references were added.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	is in today's level. If the references are old, readers may consider that this work still stays in the past level. So please try your best to update the references and make sure two thirds of the references are in recent 5 years (2009-2014).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript contains interesting results on the field. I think acceptable after major revision	Thank you for your kindly towards to our paper
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		