

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_108470
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Culture, Microscopy, and Molecular Methods for Diagnosing Gonorrhoea: A Short Communication
Type of the Article	

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>This manuscript compares the different diagnostic method of <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i>. The manuscript is important for scientific community as comparing different diagnostic methods for <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i> is essential to ensure accurate diagnosis, timely treatment, and effective public health management of gonorrhoea. It helps address the complex challenges associated with this sexually transmitted infection, including antimicrobial resistance, patient care, and the overall health of the population.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>There is not much information in the result and discussion section, or no supplementary files are provided to support this statement.</p> <p>The references are in the inconsistent form. They should be in a consistent form (like APA, MLA etc.). Moreover, there are some references from some websites, they need to be replaced with research article.</p> <p>The results and discussion part need more data to substantiate the author findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are some minor typo errors. Like "<i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i>" should be in the italic form.</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:	Lincon Mazumder
Department, University & Country	Indiana State University, USA