



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_44305
Title of the Manuscript:	Plasmid Profile of Multi-Drug Resistant Proteus spp Isolated from Patients with Wound Infection in Northeastern 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>)

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 tittle should be adjusted to reflect the results obtained. The fact that 56.67% (more than half) of isolates resisted plasmid curing suggests that the observed phenotype might not have been mediated by the plasmids. Secondly, there is no strong evidence indicating that the cured plasmid increased the sensitivity of the strains. Similarly, nothing also suggested that plasmid was removed from the strains by curing. 2. Lines 13-29 should be shortened. The elongated introduction is unnecessary and contains unneeded details. 3. Was there prior data indicating that the patients had the specific pathogen. If not, the basis for the hypothesis is unclear. After all there are various causative pathogens of such wounds. 4. How do we rule out environmental contamination of the isolates? 5. Check the references for uniformity.	1. The title did not in any way correlate the observed phenotype with the presence of plasmids. It only described the process used or method adopted to study MDR Proteus spp in this particular study. But we have adjusted our objectives to that effect. 2. We have complied with that. 3. We isolated the pathogen from the patients first before further analysis. 4. Aseptic technique was adopted in sample collection. It has been spelt out in the methodology. 5. We have done that.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	