



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	1. The objective of this manuscript should be limited to <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>. The descriptions of other bacteria are not needed. Authors should rewrite the context of this manuscript by focussing on only <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>. 2. I do not understand the table 2. This should be more simplified. 3. Why do authors use line graph in Figure 2? This figure did not show the time course of resistant rate. 4. The first choice of MRSA treatment is usually vancomycin. Why do authors represent the vancomycin susceptible patterns in this study? 5. The explanations of introduction and discussion are not directly associated with author's results. Thus the sentences are obscure.	The paper has been revised to focus on <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>. A more careful and statistical analysis has enabled a better report of this study. Tables 1 and 2 have been replaced with more appropriate Tables. Line graph has been replaced with column chart. Emphasis on MRSA has been removed and shifted to antibiotic resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>. See revised paper
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 38: I do not agree this sentence. Reference is needed. Line 54: "methicillin resistance and antibiotic resistance" should change to "antibiotic resistance". I do not understand the separation. Line 74: What is "Ceftriazone"? Line 114: I do not understand that the sensitivity rate is 52.9%. I think that it is 58.8%. Line 116: This sentence should be described in discussion section. Line 131: Reference is needed.	Paragraph has been revised and corrections effected. Ceftriazone corrected to Ceftriaxone. The statement has been deleted References have been supplied
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The numbers of bacteria investigated in this study are relatively small.	This is due to so many limitations in my research environment. Most of the limitations of this study will be overcome in subsequent studies.