

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_128903
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation of Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) from mobile phone of University students.
Type of the Article	Short 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 entitled "Isolation of Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) from Mobile Phones of University Students" holds significant importance for the scientific community. It highlights the role of mobile phones as potential vectors for the transmission of antibiotic-resistant pathogens, emphasizing the public health implications of personal device hygiene.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The authors mentioned that the isolated MRSA strains were sensitive to oxacillin; however, MRSA is typically identified based on oxacillin resistance. It is recommended that the authors re-evaluate their findings to ensure the accuracy of this study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	No clear explanation regarding number of isolates obtained Can add more data to improve the article. Reevaluate screening of MRSA Some references are missing eg.CLSI 2009	

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:	C. Uma
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India