

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJMAH_104059</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nasal Screening of Health care workers (Nursing staff) to study the Prevalence of Methicillin Resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) carriage and its antibiotic sensitivity profile in a Rural tertiary health care centre</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The work is of interest for local epidemiology and of current importance given the growing increase in antibiotic resistance worldwide.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. The bibliographical references are very outdated. The authors must include and contrast the results with current studies.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>In the text take care of the grammatical punctuation and spacing. Other observations are commented in the body of the manuscript.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Claudia Maricel Mattana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University National of San Luis, Argentina</b>