



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_34544
Title of the Manuscript:	Cefoxitin resistant profile of Staphylococcus aureus isolated from the environment of a tertiary health institution
Type of the 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	Introduction: The problem is not clear. Why describe S. aureus profile resistant to Cefoxitin and not another commonly used antimicrobial? Method: It is not necessary to characterize both the city and the city. The collection of environments through the swab is no longer appropriate, and should be avoided. Why did the authors choose this method? Specify the maximum transport time to the laboratory, the culture medium used in the transport, as well as the container (it was under refrigeration or thermal box?). With regard to the plates and media used, specify identification characteristics (brand, size, country). What are the criteria used to assess the sensitivity of isolates? CDC Criteria for the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute ... The collections of the nostril were carried out by means of circular frictions? Make it clear. Was there a statistical test to establish the sample? Results: The discussion is still restricted to describing the phenomenon, rather than explaining and validating the findings based on the international literature. To review	We choosed cefoxitin because it is used it is a better predictor of MRSA. You can see more details here : https://www.uptodate.com/contents/rapid-detection-of-methicillin-resistant-staphylococcus-aureus. or https://oup.silverchair-cdn.com/oup/backfile/Content_public/Journal/jac/55/4/10.1093 The unnecessary part of the study site is removed. The use of swab is on the decline but we have several types especially the polyesters ones that are better and still in use. The transport swabs used in this study are still very good in collection of environmental samples. Transport Swab is an easy-to-use environmental surface sample collection device for larger dilutions. Screw cap tubes are filled with either 4 ml or 10 ml diluents with a polyester swab securely attached to the cap. Transport Swab rehydrates several parts without additional dilution and sample preparation.. The time limit for the transportation of all the samples was within 30mins of collection as the Medical center is just within 10 mins walking distance from the Microbiology Lab. The description of plates type used in the study is not so necessary. The reference for this is well cited in the paper. Nostril samples were not part of this study. I think there is a



SDI Review Form 1.6

		mix up somewhere. The results of the study are discussed in the discussion and we have tried to link it up the phenomenon in other literature and similar studies
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		