

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_103678
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of bacterial sp. in traumatic, burns and post-surgical wounds: Focus on emerging drug resistance
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:

(<https://www.journalmri.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>ALL CORRECTIONS MUST BE HIGHLIGHTED.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No! sp. In the title must be replaced by species (spp.).</p> <p>No! Abstract lacks very brief Introduction/background (1–2 lines) and Methodology (1–2 lines).</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No! Most references are pretty old (except one 2016 and one 2019). Please add some recent references to the text.</p> <p>In exclusion criteria, were patients with diabetes, cancers and autoimmune disorders excluded from the study?</p> <p>Why were not anaerobic bacteria detected in this study?</p> <p>All the materials must be addressed with their manufacturers and countries of origin.</p> <p>All the genera and species must be written in <i>Italic</i> form, including those in figures.</p> <p>Was there any relationships between the infection and sex of the patients (support your answer with <i>p</i> values)?</p> <p>Which data were collected in anthropomorphic questionnaires?</p> <p>In general, all the results (e.g. those of prevalence of various bacteria and their relationships with the patients' anthropomorphic parameters) must be supported with <i>p</i> values.</p> <p>Figure 2 is unnecessary and could be removed from the manuscript.</p> <p>In “This manoeuvre is not usually observed after minor to moderate traumatic injuries...”, it’s a medical protocol rather than a manoeuvre.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>In Discussion, most reasons for the unexpected results by the authors are associated to the use of antibiotics. However, volunteers who had used antibiotics were not participated in the study as a result of exclusion criteria. Please clarify the conflict.</p> <p>The following sentence must be reworded with correct punctuation to avoid confusion: “The total number of samples collected were comparatively more (28) in age group of 21-40 years but number of infected samples were less i.e. 71% (22) were found infected but in lowest age group of 1-20 years 100% samples i.e. 12 were infected.”</p> <p>What do the authors think about lack of relationships between age and sex of the patients and prevalence of infections in their wounds?</p> <p>In Results and Discussion, the first paragraph under the subtitle of Antibiotic resistance is unnecessary and could be shortened.</p> <p>Discussion must include further reasons for the prevalence of detected bacteria in the wounds. Moreover, the current results must appropriately be compared with those by other studies.</p> <p>Discussion must include further reasons for the antibiotic resistance of detected bacteria in the wounds. Moreover, the current results must appropriately be compared with those by other studies.</p> <p>Conclusion is lengthy and must be shortened to avoid repetition of information.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No! The manuscript needs English revision.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramin Mazaheri Nezhad Fard
Department, University & Country	TUMS, Iran