

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_125753
Title of the Manuscript:	Cefoxitin and oxacillin resistance conundrums: A review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	Overall work is good	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	OK	
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.	Need modification with subsection for better understanding of the reader. Better to describe the abstract in simple language with more clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction: Reference should be cited properly. Reference 1 is missing in first place</p> <p>Methodology: Need modification Repetition should be avoided and methodology should be clearly mentioned in a stepwise manner. Languages and too many words making the methodology very complex to understand, though it's very simple and sequential steps to detect BORSA from clinical isolates.</p> <p>Result: Not clear. Repetition of methodology should be avoided. Too many word and complex sentence. Better to present graphically or in tabular form for better understanding.</p> <p>Discussion: Need to restructure properly in a step wise pattern in the line of result section. Need comparison with recent research locally and globally. Better to avoid repetition of methodology too many time.</p> <p>Conclusion: Should be precise with major output and refection on the whole study. Clear message is missing.</p>	
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.	Need much modification as mentioned in the previous section to make the write up technically sound. Result and Discussion part should be compact. Need modification on the languages and sentences of the write up to make it interesting to the researcher and clinician.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Out of 30, 23 references are before 2016. It's better to compare the study with references within last 5 - 6 Years.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is complex with and lost the flow of presentation. Suggested to present systemically with simple words and clarity.	
Optional/General comments	Overall good	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Santanu Hazra
Department, University & Country	North Bengal Medical College, India