

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_129341
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Antimicrobial Susceptibility of Mycoplasma hominis and Ureaplasma Species among women in Dakar
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	After studying the manuscript thoroughly, it can be affirmed that this paper will play a pivotal role in the scientific community and it is important for new researchers about the prevalence of mycoplasma infections (<i>M. hominis</i> and <i>U. urealyticum</i>) and the antibiotic susceptibility profile among women in Dakar.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suited to the content and the idea of the paper.	
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.	The abstract is very good with the key concepts of the paper and it is comprehensive about introduction results and aim of the study in short.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is appropriate in all section and structure of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific strength and technical soundness through its accurate methodology and comprehensive data analysis. The authors have employed a well-designed experimental structures.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In terms of this paper, I think the list of references need to updates.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Yes, the quality of the language of this article is suitable.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Naser Hussein
Department, University & Country	Afak General Hospital, Iraq