



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_9726
Title of the Manuscript:	Community-associated methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (CA-MRSA) in children: a microbiological and epidemiological study
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 <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	The Author should enrich his abstract to contain a brief explanation of the method used such as how many samples collected and the type of samples collected. He should avoid the use of abbreviation not already introduced and check line 18-19, they are repetition of line 16-17 By his title, he is only working on CA-MRSA. But he is dwelling more on HCA-MRSA even in his methodology. If he is really working on CA-MRSA, samples should not be collected from hospitalized children.	Done We changed the title
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There is no statistical data to back up his results. And the table is not explicit enough His aim is not in agreement with his title and the identification of HCA-MRSA did not reflect in the title. Ethical committee is not to approve a result but to study a topic and consider the application for collection of samples from in patience	There is really no statistical work to be done. The authors debated and decided to exlude the table. We changed the title to agree with the aim. The initiatin of the study was approved by the Ethics Committee.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Ethical permission if sorted for was not well represented	It is the methods section.
---	---	----------------------------