



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_23268
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of antibiotic resistance genes among Pseudomonas aeruginosa strains isolated from Burn Patients in 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	- Line 7-13: The methodology was still unclear; this study detected antibiotic resistance gene, but there was no explanation of the methods used for the detection of antibiotic resistance genes other than MBLs. - Line 14: Why there was a statement of result "and presences of class 1 integron were detected" in the section of methodology. - Line 23: In keyword, why β-lactamases was chosen, and the study on focus on β-lactamases. - Line 59: This statement was not consistent with the existing statement in line 7/64/106. Which one was correct? - Line 81-87; 88-99; 99-101: Please give a more detailed explanation how to perform the method, so that another reader better understand and be able to reproduced it. - Line 102-104: There are no results of the statistical analysis presented in this manuscript.	- by PCR and Sequencing techniques. - and class 1 integron were performed by PCR and Sequencing techniques. - It's been omitted. - It's been accomplished. - It's been accomplished. - This study was descriptive
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Line 18, 114,-115, 125, 127, 129, 161, 169, 170: No absolute number/denominator were entered with percentage. - Line 29: May better to give reference in that statement. - Line 112-113: There were no result statement of piperacilline/tazobactam, ceftriaxone, and cefepime in the table 1. - Line 175 -182: This statement need to be rewritten	- It's been accomplished. - It's been accomplished. - It's been omitted. - It's been accomplished. - It's been accomplished.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with a clear focused conclusion about the presence of genes among <i>P.aeruginosa</i> and not only for MBLs. This study was not focusing in MBLs detection. 5. References: There were some mistaken in the writing of references, such as reference no. 7, 8, 10, 3, 15, 16, 17. Please check it again and consistency is needed in accordance with the instructions. 6. Line 249: No absolute denominator entered with the percentage in the table 1.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article has a good idea. The research question is clear, but there are some inconsistency: - Time of the study - Statistical analysis The article is unwell constructed.	