



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_23800
Title of the Manuscript:	Staphylococcus aureus: Nasal carriage in health care workers and in-patients with special reference to MRSA.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Abstract: Line 17; higher isolation – higher rate of isolation Line 13-14 and 21; constutive and inducible clindamycin resistance should be replaced by constitutive macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B (cMLS_B) and inducible macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B (iMLS_B). The later terminology has been mentioned all over the manuscript and uniformity must be mentioned. Result: Table 3 on HCWs ; total no of MSSA shows 95 and MRSA 16 Text line 110 (result) and 180 (discussion); total <i>S. aureus</i> isolates were 84 and of these 16 were MRSA. Which one is correct? Discussion: Line 194-195; Numbers of male from whom MRSA was isolated should be mentioned. (Because there is no table on in-patients and also not shown in text.) In-patients: MRSA was isolated from 41 (55.4%) males HCW: MRSA was isolated from 10 (62.5%) males Line 201-202; Numbers should be mentioned like in like 194-195. Line 207-208; Numbers should be mentioned. Line 225-226; Numbers should be mentioned.	Dear reviewer, thank you for your valuable suggestions. Hope you find the changes up to your satisfaction. Abstract Line 17, 13,14 and 21 corrected Results There was a significant mistake in calculating the MSSA isolates. The total no of <i>S. aureus</i> isolated was indeed 84 only. All the mistakes have been rectified including the ones in the tables. Thank you for pointing it out. Discussion The no of male in-patients have been mentioned in line 194-95 Line 201-02, 07-08, 25-26: numbers mentioned