

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_99179
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND ANTIBIOTIC-RESISTANCE INDICES OF BACTERIAL PATHOGENS OF OTITIS MEDIA AMONG PATIENTS ATTENDING A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN CALABAR, NIGERIA
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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- The manuscript deals with bacterial otitis externa disease and it is antibiotic sensitivity, the drug sensitivity for bacterial isolate was important in clinically used to choose the most suitable drug and prevention of development of resistance; so the manuscript was important in the scientific community</p> <p>2- The article's title was suitable</p> <p>3- The abstract of the article was comprehensive</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure of the manuscript were appropriate</p> <p>5- The manuscript was scientifically correct</p> <p>6- Only 30 % of references were up to 5 years ago, so yes it is recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language quality of the article was suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please correct the manuscript as I noted in the main text after completing my revision, the manuscript was good writing, the abstract, introduction, methodology, result, and discussion were suitable, overall the manuscript was good and beneficial for the field so I recommend o accepting it with minor revision.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ammar Mahmood Al-Aalim
Department, University & Country	Mosul University, Iraq