

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.	The importance of any research related to ESBL is to confess the presence or the absence of the ESBL strains and which antibiotic is available or suitable for the treatment but here the author explained the existence not the treatment	The treatment has been included.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Comprehensive but it not include the presence of full term conclusion and this cannot be accepted of the submission of the paper also there is a wrong part in the calculation of the percentage in (The age group of ≤29 years formed the majority of the subjects with 26.3% (175/266)) where it must 65.7 % according to the calculation written in the article	The conclusion has been added. It has been corrected. It was an oversight.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Correct as a data expression but there are mistakes in calculation please revise all the calculations	They have been revised.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	In the discussion in the part of explanation of the ESBL producing bacteria mentioned in several article one article as a reference is not enough	Other articles have been cited.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable but small things to rearrange as example More as it is written like this in the manuscript but must be More as with space between more and as	Noted
Optional/General comments	Where is the conclusion of the article in the main text?? Before each table write its caption not all of the captions before the tables	The tables have been corrected with the captions before each table. The conclusion has been added.

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)	