

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.	The manuscript set out to screen Senegalese women for the presence of genital Mycoplasmas. Also to test the isolates for antimicrobial susceptibility. They were able to detect Mycoplasma hominis and Ureaplasma urealyticum. This I find to be important in the reproductive health of women especially reproductive aged women.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is very adequate	
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.	Abstract is quite comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is simple and scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and quite current	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used is good enough for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Page 6; Table 1: To remove grid lines from the table. ● Page 9: Figure 1 caption: To correct the spelling of the word "urealiticum" to "urealyticum". Likewise in pages 12, 13, 14. ● They should also try to write the names of the organisms in italics as I indicated in the Manuscript. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nneka Regina Agbakoba
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria