SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
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	**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	**Under the 'materials and method' the materials should be merged appropriately with the sample collection and preparation, sensitivity testing.** **Results: Since there is a table presenting the results explaining the table in the text is a repetition** **Discussion: Mutation of the organism chromosome was not determined in this study and the resistance level observed does not indicate this, so comparing this in percentage with previous study is not necessary (last paragraph)**	This is expunged as it is not necessary. Ok. We have rephrased the paragraph
Minor REVISION comments	Small sample size The location of the sampling was not stated (are the table tops from offices or wards, are they staff or patients' hands?) MIC and MBC are for which antibiotics, cefoxitin? Also the unit for the various dilution concentration was not stated. In Table 1, the key to RD was not included.	 This is captured in the manuscript already. Yes to cefoxitin. Included now.
Optional/General comments		