



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_5024
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of Enterococcus faecalis with different forms of dental diseases among patients visiting a tertiary hospital in Ekiti State, Nigeria
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	1. Every three years, CLSI standards are updated by the CLSI Subcommittee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing and several dedicated working groups to ensure that new methodology is included in the documents. The study has used values and guidelines from 2005 which are considered outdated; thus, a more updated guideline (2012) must be used in place to come up with conclusions. 2. This study claims to be a "first" in the region; thus, it is not fair to compare it with Pinheiro et al. (2004) and claim there is a rise in vancomycin resistant strains.	1. The old version of the guideline has been replaced with the new one (i.e CLSI 2012). 2. The statement has been deleted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Study such as this will benefit if 16s rDNA analysis is carried out on the isolates and similarities and differences between the strains are determined. But I understand that 16s rDNA analysis on all the isolates will be very expensive; so, I suggest that interesting isolates to be identified by the author and the analysis is carried out on them. I would strongly suggest the analysis is carried out on the vancomycin resistant strain. 2. English needs to be improved.	1. We appreciate your kind suggestion. We will try to carry out 16s rDNA analysis on all the isolates in the our current study of these organisms. 2. The grammar of the manuscript has been overhauled.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		