

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Pathogen Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPR_122910</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ANTIMICROBIAL SUSCEPTIBILITY PROFILE AND OCCURRENCE OF VANCOMYCIN RESISTANCE AMONG CLINICAL ISOLATES OF STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS IN ENUGU METROPOLIS, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	1. The manuscript is an important topic for the scientific community if properly presented	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	1. No. The study design is a comparative descriptive study, so the title should be <b>"Occurrence and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profile of Vancomycin Resistance among Clinical Isolates of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> in Enugu Metropolis, Nigeria"</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.	1. Based on the work done, the abstract has captured everything and I think that is okay. 2. The conclusion is not based on the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1. Most of the subsections under materials and methods are not okay. There was no need to break down sub-headings from the study design. 2. Section of results <b>Tables and figures</b> , Please, check the format according to the research writing styles. 3. The information provided seems to lack a concise abstract structure. It covers background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions but could benefit from clearer organization. Including statistical significance, addressing limitations, and adhering to standard abstract conventions would enhance clarity	
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.	1. I don't think a study like this is scientifically correct without ethical approval and written informed consent by participants.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1. Yes. Not need to add more references	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The language quality of the article could be improved for scholarly communication. There are some grammatical issues and unclear statements that may affect clarity and precision. Attention to detail, proofreading and clarification of certain points would enhance the overall quality of the manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. The subject of the paper is proper and valid. But the overall writing style needs a rewrite. 2. May be suitable for publication if the above comments are taken into consideration.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Ghanem Mohammed Ghanem Mahjaf</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shendi University, Sudan</b>