



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_29869
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Ascitic Fluid Bacterial Pathogens in Spontaneous Bacterial Peritonitis in Nile Delta and its Impact on Clinical Outcome of these Patients
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	This is a paper providing some interesting piece of information of value for those working in the field covered by this manuscript. I do have the following concerns: The “Conclusion: While Gram negative bacteria were the main infectious agents causing SBP a few decades ago, and are still reported to be so in the most recent recommendations and reviews, Gram positive bacteria are now predominant and there is a rising prevalence of bacteria with reduced susceptibility to cephalosporins and fluoroquinolones. Current international guidelines recommend the use of a third generation cephalosporin for empirical treatment of SBP which raise the questions about these guidelines and if they are still valid.” Should state the conclusion of this study only and not include previous data or speculations. The same applies to the Abstract as at the end of the paper. In the “Keywords”: SBP should be spelled out The authors state that: “All patients were subjected to history taking, clinical examination, liver function tests including: serum 48 bilirubin level, albumin level, prothrombin time and activity, renal function tests e.g. serum urea and 49 creatinine, abdominal Ultra Sound” without summarising or tabulating the results of these studies. This should be done or the text omitted. The authors state that “Ascitic fluid sampling was done for every patient”. Please describe the method used in few words for the reader to more easily understand the manuscript.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The sentence: “This study was carried out on 247 patients with liver cirrhosis and ascites who met clinical criteria for suspicion of SBP” is repeated in section 2 and 3. Is suitable in the result section only.	
Minor REVISION comments	See above-	
Optional/General comments	I suggest language revision	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Einar Arnbjornsson</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Pediatric Surgery, Skåne University Hospital and Lund University, Lund, Sweden</i>