



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_21376
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular analysis of Staphylococcus aureus Infections in Trinidad and Tobago
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 (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	<p>The authors have analysed the diversity of <i>S. aureus</i> clonal complexes in their country. The findings of this study will help the local community.</p> <p>The whole work was designed well and executed through standard procedures.</p> <p>The manuscript was written in a scientifically sound manner.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>S. aureus was mentioned as Staph. aureus in few places that has to be followed similarly with others. Ex. In abstract- Result. 3rd line, line-61</p> <p>Introduction: Lines from 26 to 39 should be included in the discussion part and not there, as this disusses the earlier studies done in their country.</p> <p>Line 48: rewrite as: to investigate the characteristics (delete many)</p> <p>Table 1 & 2: first heading rows to be bolded. Table 1: Column 1 Age group- write as Age group (in years), N (%), Hospital associated N(%),Community</p>	<p>This has been consistently corrected using <i>S. aureus</i> format.</p> <p>We agree with the reviewer and have deleted what was not necessary at the Introduction section. We have kept what is relevant and pointed the necessary under Discussion section.</p> <p>This has been revised and reads follows "This observational cross-sectional study of <i>S. aureus</i> infection was carried out..."</p> <p>All these have been changed as suggested by the reviewer</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>associated N(%),p value (%)</p> <p>Same changes for table 2</p> <p>Table 3: N(%)</p> <p>Line 227: skin or mucous</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript was written in scientifically sound manner and has good background work done.</p>	<p>This has been corrected to skin</p>