

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_127146
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Genetic diversity of the methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus isolates circulating in Fako Division, South West Region, Cameroon.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is significant as it investigates the genetic diversity and prevalence of methicillin-resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (MRSA) isolates in Fako Division, Cameroon. Given the global and public health challenges posed by MRSA, understanding its genetic diversity, especially in underrepresented regions like Cameroon, is crucial. This study adds valuable insights into MRSA epidemiology, particularly in a setting where community-associated MRSA strains can intersect with hospital and livestock sources, underlining the need for a "One Health" approach to address MRSA spread and control.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is appropriate and concise, accurately reflecting the study's focus on MRSA genetic diversity in a specific geographic region. An alternative title could be: <i>"Genetic characterization and diversity of MRSA isolates in Fako Division, Cameroon."</i></p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview but could benefit from clearer details on the study's primary findings, especially the specific SCCmec types identified and their significance. Adding a sentence on the implications of these findings for local and global health would enhance its impact.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clear sections that follow a logical flow, from introduction and methodology to results and discussion. However, the study design and participant/sample descriptions in the methods section could benefit from a bit more elaboration for added clarity.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The study is scientifically robust and technically sound, employing standard PCR and sequencing techniques to identify and characterize SCCmec elements in MRSA. The methodology is comprehensive, and the use of BLASTN for sequence comparison enhances the reliability of the genetic diversity findings. The manuscript contributes to epidemiological knowledge by revealing MRSA's prevalence and distribution of SCCmec types across hospital, livestock, and community settings.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :-</p>	<p>The references are recent and relevant, with a good balance of foundational and recent studies to support the discussion. However, some additional sources on global SCCmec diversity, particularly within African contexts, might enhance the discussion section. Recommended references include recent studies on SCCmec types and their global epidemiological implications, such as updated reviews or meta-analyses on MRSA's genetic diversity.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is generally clear, but there are a few areas where the flow could be improved for readability, especially in complex sentences within the discussion. Minor grammar corrections and additional proofreading are recommended to enhance the quality of scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	While the discussion effectively connects findings with global MRSA trends, it could benefit from a more explicit focus on the "One Health" implications and public health strategies suited to resource-limited settings, as these aspects are critical for regional stakeholders.  No competing interests were detected based on the manuscript content.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Nazar Mahmoud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Hospital Limerick, Ireland</b>