

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_102224</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Plasmid-Encoded Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria of Surgical Wound Isolates From Three Hospitals in Akoko Land</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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is definitely important to the scientific community. Surgical site infection is a major cause morbidity and at times mortality in surgical patients. Therefore studies on the microbial aetiology and antibiotics sensitivity pattern will always be of interest to the scientific.</p> <p>2. Yes the title is suitable as it aptly described the study.</p> <p>3. Yes the abstract is compressive. Though the abstract is structured, headings 'introduction, methods, Results and conclusions' should be included.</p> <p>4. Yes the subsections are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Many of the reference are older than 10years. The authors should strive to include more recent reference.</p> <p>7. In the last paragraph of the abstract a space should be inserted between ' the and three'</p> <p>8. FOR EASIER REVIEW AND COMMENTS I SUGGEST THAT THE SENTENCES OF THE MANUSCRIPT SHOULD BE NUMBERED SUBSEQUENTLY.</p> <p>9. INTRODUCTION: the definition of wound appears incorrect. Wound is defined as damage to the integrity of biological tissues including skin, mucus membranes, and organ tissues. Furthermore, the authors failed to cite the source of their definition. The authors should correct this definition and include a reference.</p> <p>10. MATERIALS AND METHODS: the authors should define what constitutes wound infection. This is important for reproducibility</p> <p>11. How soon after sample collection was the sample taken to the laboratory. Who took the samples, from what part of the wound was the sample taken.</p> <p>12. CONCLUSIONS: this should be paraphrased to; 1. This study has identified bacteria associated with surgical wounds infections in the study population. The offending organisms include 2 gram positives and 5 gram negatives.</p> <p>13. SHV plasmid and CTX-enzymes are most likely responsible for the resistance pattern observed.</p> <p>14. The recommendation is too verbose. The authors should paraphrase. Also the entire work need grammatical review to improve/enhance understanding of the message the authors are trying to convey.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, however, grammatical review is needed as stated above. For example Microsoft Grammer and Spelling software can be used.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Odo Chinonso</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alex-Ekwueme Federal University Teaching Hospital Abakaliki, Nigeria</b>