

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_SAJRM_111429   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Prevalence of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus in Nasal Cavity of Medical Students at Shendi University, Sudan |
| 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>1. The manuscript is actually an important topic for the scientific community if properly presented</p> <p>2. Title is okay</p> <p>3. Based on the work done, abstract has captured everything and I think that is okay</p> <p>4. Most of the subsections under materials and methods are not okay. There was no need breaking down in sub-headings from study design... down to culturing method</p> <p>5. I don't think a study like this is scientifically correct without ethical approval and written informed consent by participants.</p> <p>6. References are not sufficient to be considered for publication and then, too old for a work that was done in 2022 and, written in 2023.</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>The language used in the manuscript is too poor to be considered for a publication in English. I would suggest this manuscript is given to an English expert to reconstruct or, submitted to the English writing tool to work on all the sentences and words</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>May be suitable for publication if the above comments are taken into consideration</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>Rachael Terumbur Duche</b>                   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Nigeria</b> |