



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27253
Title of the Manuscript:	Nosocomial infection and antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of bacteria isolated from admitted patients with sign of infection at Jimma University Specialized Hospital, Jimma, Ethiopia
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 42: In Ethiopia, a report from Tikur Anbessa and Mekelle hospitals indicated how the problem is serious. Should be rephrased as "A report from Tikur Anbessa and Mekelle hospitals indicated it is a serious problem in Ethiopia. Line 53: delete " being" Line 191 : replace developed with showed Line 200: Table 2 please use keys to represent the organisms. Line 206 : replace Towards with based on Line 261- 263 : how did you evaluate the Methicillin resistance (MRSA) ? Oxacillin I guess? I was thinking the authors could have confirmed this (Unusual) high prevalence of MRSA with agents like Cefoxitin. Cefoxitin is now accepted as a better method for detecting MRSA with high efficiency and has been	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	used as an alternative to PCR in resource constrained areas. Thus I suggest the result could be interpreted as “95 % of the <i>S.aureus</i> are oxacilin resistant and are likely MRSA isolates”. References: MOST of the references are old. In order to reflect that this paper is based on the recent researches, the authors need to update the references. New references can reflect that this paper is in today's level. So please try your best to update the references and make sure two thirds of the references are in recent 5 years (2011-2016).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Accept after the minor comments are addressed by the authors. It's a good work: scientifically and technically sound.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Agulu Campus, Awka, Nigeria