**SDI Review Form 1.6**

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | British Microbiology Research Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_BMRJ_25360** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **METHICILLIN-RESISTANCE IN Staphylococcus aureus 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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | **I have read the manuscript and the following are my observations.**<br><br>**ABSTRACT:** This section should be divided into aims, methodology, results and conclusion.<br>**AIMS**: This is saying "Methicillin resistance and antibiotic resistance pattern of S. aureus" whereas the title of the manuscript reads "Methicillin resistance in S. aureus". Why is there difference in title and aims? In addition, there is tautology because methicillin is also an antibiotic. Please put your sentences properly.<br>**RESULTS:** Resistance in ofloxacin was 41.2% while ceftriaxone was 23.5%. How come ofloxacin had the highest sensitivity of 52.9%? what can you say of the ceftriaxone? Also, why drawing conclusion on fluoroquinolones in the result section? What will the conclusion section look like?<br>C**ONCLUSION**: This should be re-written because the authors were drawing conclusion on multiple drug resistance when the title stated "methicillin resistance" what do we accept, the title or the aims?<br>I**NTRODUCTION**: This section should be abridged.<br>LINE 54: Methicillin resistance and antibiotic resistance is tautology. Please put it properly.<br>**MATERIALS AND METHODS**:<br>LINE 60: It reads "samples were collected from March to April,2015" whereas duration of study on the abstract section reads " March to June". Why the difference?<br>**CONTROL ORGANISM**: Was a control organism (S. | I have written in accordance with SDI Instructions to authors<br><br>The topic of the manuscript has been modified. Emphasis is shifted from MRSA to antibiotic resistance.<br>A more careful and statistical analysis has enabled a better report of this work.<br><br>See revised paper.<br><br>The manuscript has been widely revised.<br><br>This is corrected No control organism was used |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | aureus) used in this study?<br>**Unidentified rod-shaped bacteria**: Why were they not identified. It seems that biochemical tests used in this study was grossly inadequate judging from the table of identification scheme (table 1). In any research work efforts should be made to used readily available diagnostic tests for analysis, for example API tests, etc .<br>**RESULTS:**<br>Table 1: Identification scheme for S. aureus is not necessary, instead, it should give an overall result of the data obtained.<br>Table 2: Zones of inhibition of antibiotics are not necessary, instead it should give a summary of susceptibility pattern to antibiotics.<br>LINE 116 TO 118: It reads "ofloxacin receives the highest sensitivity (52.9%)…….. this statement should be properly corrected as ceftriaxone has the highest sensitivity based on 23.5% resistance<br>**NOTE:** The result section should be properly readjusted to accommodate the new tables (1&2).<br>**DISCUSSION**:<br>LINE 134: "The 100% resistance of oxacillin is alarming". This statement should not arise because the sample size in this study was small and so such inference is wrong.<br>**NOTE:** The discussion is not appealing to the reader(s). It should be re-discussed to catch the attention of the reader(s). | This has been deleted. These test kits are far above the means of most researchers in Nigeria<br><br>The Tables have been replaced with more appropriate ones<br><br>See revised paper<br><br>Discussion is re-discussed |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | | |
| **Optional/General** comments | | |