

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_128759
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF EXTENDED SPECTRUM BETA-LACTAMASE PRODUCING BACTERIA IN PATIENTS WITH WOUND INFECTIONS ATTENDING TERTIARY HOSPITALS IN ENUGU, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Check punctuation, spacing, and grammar throughout the paper. 2. Avoid invalid statements. For example, male had a higher frequency of ESBL. The reason was the number of male patients was double than females. 3. The authors can't make any conclusion. 4. The paper just stretches the findings. 5. Microscopy of stained smear from the pus is not done to evaluate the pathogens which do not grow in ordinary media. 6. Anaerobic culture not done. 7. Aerobic culture incubation in 24 hrs is not enough for slow growing microbes. 8. Disc diffusion is not a standard method to establish ESLB. MIC values are required. 9. Table 1 and 4 are irrelevant. Conclusion: It is an incomplete study which does not fully follow scientific methods.	1.The punctuations and grammar have been cross-checked. 2.The statements have been expunged 3.The conclusion has been included. 4.Other additions have been included 5.It was not done 6.It was noted in the limitation of the study that the materials used in the microbiological culture was basically for the isolation of aerobic pathogens and as such did not take into account the anaerobic pathogens. 7.Noted.Corrections have been taken for subsequent research. 8.We followed guidelines provided by CLSI 2021.Phenotypic confirmatory test was done to confirm ESBL .Refer to methodology. 9. Table 1 and 4 have been expunged.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	