



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_13736
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROBIOLOGY OF CHRONIC OTITIS MEDIA
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	1. According to the methodology used for the sample collection it is not clear if this study of external otitis or middle ear otitis. Authors never performed tympanocentesis for sample collection thus one assumes it is an external otitis media study. In that same line, it is interest to notice than non H. flu isolate was obtained, being the most common cause of otitis media and that fungus where isolated, being extremely rare pathogens of the middle ear. 2. In the Material & Methods section initially it is mentioned that the total isolates are 176. However, in the results section, line 169, it is written that "based on morphological and biochemical characteristics a total of 263 bacterial isolates belonging to 10...". It is not clear why the number of samples increased. 3. It is important to discuss what effect may have the several passes into the different cultures media in the results.	<i>It is a middle ear infection. Most of the patients had wax coming out from the ear and were certified by ENT surgeons to be having the infection of the middle ear</i> !76 samples were collected but 263 isolates were obtained. In some samples there were co-infection with two or more isolates
Minor REVISION comments	1. Authors must clarify in what period of time they isolated the samples. 2. Authors must clarify why they selected the age range of less than 1 year to more than 60 years, not being this paediatric or an adult study. 3. Most of the references used are not recent. 4. In the abstract section, numbers must be revised.	That has been done in the reviewed manuscript The references are not old for we have many that were published in 2006 and above i.e. 2006, 2007 , 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012 Their are many people in the authors country with the infection of the middle here and age at



SDI Review Form 1.6

	For example, in line 16 it is written "Of 31 isolates that showed positivity for β haemolysis, 7 (70.0 %) were <i>S. pyogenes</i> and 15 (23.1 %) from <i>S. aureus</i> ; should this be the opposite?	times ranged from 1 to 60yr above
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Until authors do not clarify if this is an middle or external ear microbiology study, according to this referrer's opinion it should not be accepted for publication.	The author clarified that it was Otitis media. Media here shows Middle.