

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_125321
Title of the Manuscript:	Sputum Culture Contaminants and their Drugs Susceptibility Patterns among TB-suspected Patients at Epicentre Mbarara Research Centre, Uganda
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	<p>Article is good, emphasizes the importance of strengthening decontamination procedures. There was no need for test susceptibility of contaminants. It will help community to develop better digestion decontamination procedures needed when mycobacterial cultures are dealt with</p> <p>There is a high prevalence of contamination in TB sputum cultures, highlighting the need for stringent aseptic techniques alongside current standards to improve the detection of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	suitable	
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.	good	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	<p>Methodology is adequate.</p> <p>Sputum contamination is most commonly encountered in mycobacterial labs.</p> <p>Authors have taken one step ahead even to check drug susceptibility patterns</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More than required references are there in the article. Most of them are recent	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>MAJOR problem is Antibiotic susceptibility testing of BACILLUS SPP. Which is done as per CLSI M45 document. Disc diffusion method is not advised. MIC method is indicated.</p> <p>Authors can OMIT the sensitivity pattern of bacillus if MIC not done.</p> <p>For bacterial susceptibility testing CLSI M100 needs to be mentioned.</p>	
Optional/General comments	ARTICLE IS GOOD. METHODOLOGY NEEDS TO BE ROBUST.	

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:	Dhanashree Inamdar
Department, University & Country	Mamata Medical College and Hospital, India