



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_25360
Title of the Manuscript:	METHICILLIN-RESISTANCE IN <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ISOLATES FROM PATIENTS ADMITTED AT SPECIALIST HOSPITAL OKITIPUPA, ONDO STATE, WESTERN NIGERIA.
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	- The objective and title were not matching with the results of the study. - There were absolutely no study results of MRSA that provide entirely in the manuscript. - Coagulase negative Staphylococci (CoNS), except <i>S.lugdunensis</i> obviously not MRSA event though AST (Antibiotic Sensitivity Testing) results show resistance to oxacillin or methicillin. - Line 28-29: Please provide the epidemiology data of MRSA from the nearby area which has some similarities in ethnicity, geography, etc. - Statement in line 38-42 with reference no. 14: Please clarify your statement in the manuscript. - Why this statement use italic. - Ref. no.14 describe about MRSA phenotype mecA gene, not mention at all about vancomycin used to combat MRSA. Which one of the references provides that information? - Statement in line 50-53: Why this statement in italic also? - In section sample collection, line 59-63: The method of samples collection has been described in the manuscript more appropriate for MRSA screening. So, the aim/objective and conclusion of this study should be adjusted with this method. - On the result section of the abstract should not have said "flouroquinolones may be the drugs of choice in the treatment..." cause the site of specimen were not from clinical samples, such as sputum, pus, CSF, etc.	The title, aims and objectives have been revised to be more appropriate. A more careful and statistical analysis has enabled a better report of this study. Italics has been removed. Emphasis on MRSA has been replaced with antibiotic resistance. This section is now appropriate to the new title. This has been corrected With the altered title, no more revision is needed here.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. In section 2.1 Sample collection, handling, culture, and identification was no explanation of the method used for the detection of MRSA. Statement in line 76 is not enough to describe it. Please refer to CLSI (2014) M100-S24 table 3E page 128-130. 8. Statement in line 126-128: Please provide the information of analysis method and p value significance. 9. Line 130-131: Please give the reference for this statement. 10. Ref. no 23-26 disappears in the main text. 11. Statement in line 152-158 should be rewritten.	Done. Done They are no longer relevant Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article is unwell constructed. It should be rewritten with a clear focus objective, methodology, results and conclusion of MRSA, not <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> or CoNS.	See revised article. Focus is no longer on MRSA