



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_18522
Title of the Manuscript:	Inducible and Constitutive Clindamycin Resistance in Staphylococcus spp. Strains Isolated from a Neonatal Intensive Care Unit
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>)

See below for comments.



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	1. It is not clear how it was decided how many specimens to obtain from each type of environmental source. There were very few fomites cultured but a great deal of time is spent in commenting upon the importance of the resistant organisms in the environment. This needs explanation in the paper and some comment needs to be made why and when these specimens were obtained and how the the sites were chosen for culturing. We already know that most environmental surfaces are contaminated with staphylococcal species and numerous other organisms. 2. The exact details of all the culturing techniques is probably not necessary. "Standard microbiology techniques" with references would be more appropriate in many of the places where details are overly specified. 3. Figures 1 and 2 are not necessary and can easily be placed in the text – the figures waste space and add nothing to the paper that a sentence or two would more aptly summarize. 4. Figure 3 would be much more effectively presented in a Table with percentages listed. 5. Figure 4 would be more effectively presented	1. The choice of selected fomites for research with industry professionals, based on the locations that come in contact with the patient more frequently, which would increase the risk of bacterial transmission surface-host. 2. We were made the modifications proposed by the reviewer. 3. Corrections carried out as orientation reviewer. 4. Corrections carried out as orientation reviewer. 5. Corrections carried out as orientation reviewer. 6. and 7. Trace the strains of resistance profile contaminants from the neonatal ICU environment is so very important, considering that this information is new, that is, was never carried out epidemiological monitoring in this area of the institution. Thus, with the knowledge brought in this



SDI Review Form 1.6

	in a Table format as well. 6. I do not believe that there is any new resistance information added to the literature by these findings. 7. Typing of organisms is not helpful unless specifically tied to resistance patterns in documented neonatal intensive care unit-associated infections in the same environment. So information regarding clinical data from the same neonatal ICU during the same time frame as the environmental sampling would be very effective in showing the potential importance of the environmental sampling.	study, appropriate measures may be taken to safer sector patients.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	If this article is to be published in English language, someone who speaks native English must correct the too-numerous-to-count issues with the way in which this is written. Many of the sentences are in wrong tense, many are in wrong order (phrases out of alignment), and many only make sense after significant reading over and over again. It would be similar to my trying to publish an article in Spanish or Portuguese, even if I “learned” the language. It wouldn’t sound right. This whole article does not read right or sound right. Almost every sentence needs to be rewritten by someone with native English skills. This is simply very ineffective communication.	The study was submitted to a revision of English.