



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_27866
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and antibiotic resistance of streptococcus pneumonia among different hospitals in Saudi Arabia
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	1. It should always be written the full name the first time mentioned in the text and the acronym in parentheses, and in subsequent acronym only. 2. It should not mention that there are significant between the total tested samples and samples positifas as it is irrelevant. 3. Authors should mention the age of patients with CAP and positive culture, because in children depending on age are considered some pathogenic bacteria or not. 4. 4 or 5 hospitals are those involved? because the text says 4, but in Figure 3.2 says 5. 5. In CAP, P aeruginosa is not considered pathogen. 6. Mentioning that microorganisms are the "others", both CAP and HAP, since both have a very important frequency. 7. Remove the tables. 8. Do not repeat in the text the information presented in the figures. 9. Update references to 2014-2016. 10. Mention that the study was approved by the local ethics committee and patients gave written informed consent. Ethical issue: Yes, the authors do not mention that the study was approved by the local ethics	1. YES.. Edited in Abstract line 7 yellow highlighted 2. YES..Edited in Results section previous lines 81-83 removed. 3. NO.. As the data collected not initially sorted on based of age rather strains were isolated later. 4. YES. In materials and methods line 50. Its very clearly mentioned four hospitals highlighted. Reviewer while reviewing confused it with another figure. Figure only reveals the proportion of etiological agents in hospital wards. 5. YES in results line 86 highlighted 6. 1 7. NO. Tables can't be removed as it shows all antibiotics susceptibility and resistance pattern against gram positive and negative isolates. 8. YES. Checked the whole manuscript 9. YES. Most of references in discussions are up to date 10. YES... mentioned in materials and method . line.52-54 highlighted yellow



SDI Review Form 1.6

	committee and patients gave written informed consent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is useful but requires major revision.	All the necessary modification/ changes have been interpreted for further.