

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_95032
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Characterization and Antibigram of Staphylococcus and Pseudomonas species in the Ear and Throat among Patients Attending Rivers State Teaching Hospital
Type of the 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p><b>Yes, very important. It supplies education about antibiotic resistance and antibiograms.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. To the Point. Little lengthy, but accurate.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the methods used are very descriptive. The abstract supplies ample education about major findings of the manuscript.</b>  <b>Yes. Provides a clear pathway for the manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. The science is proved and described well in the manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. Great references.</b></p>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	There are a few minor word changes. Example – line 7 of abstract you write “side” for which side of the ear. I would recommend saying “laterality.”	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This is one of the most thorough manuscripts I have read. It describes everything that was performed and the results.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thomas Schulte
Department, University & Country	University of Nebraska Medical Center, USA