



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_5533
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiotic resistance patterns and plasmid profile of methicillin resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> isolates from human samples
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	The method and result sections need to be revised .Comparison of plasmid bands directly with that of the standards is not scientific and unacceptable,this has le d the author to give wrong discussion and conclusions. THE AUTHOR should plot a graph of Mobility of the standard bands against the log. Of the Molecular Weight of the standard used. Each sample band molecular weight will be interpolated on the standard curve obtained earlier.The author should do the same with the result obtained for restriction enzyme analysis.The individual s used by the author should have been confirmed Healthy by a qualified Medical Officer before collecting their samples for investigation,if not the entire research will have no foundation and be null andvoid.Also ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE ARE COMMONLY FOUND IN THE HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENT.	The method of comparison of plasmid bands directly with that of the standards has been used by many workers even in current articles; please see Al-Hamdani and Hamad (2012). No method is perfect. All methods have demerit(s). However, it has been noted. This is a community based study. Our team included a medical practitioner. We obtained an informed consent. Most of our participants are not lettered and do not speak English language. The CA-MRSA is currently gaining wide epidemiologic success than HA-MRSA. The former strain is more virulent than the later
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The abstract should rewritten in line with the above corrections,ditto RESULT AND DISCUSSION. The author should compare his results with other scientist results and provide reasons for differences or similarties.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	THE WHOLE PAPER SHOULD BE WRITTEN IN CONFORMING WITH THE KNOWN SCIENTIFIC STANDARD OF PUBLICATION.	We are reporting and our results that must not necessarily be compared to other works. What if they are unprecedented? However, I take note.