

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80876
Title of the Manuscript:	EXTRACELLULAR PROTEASES PRODUCTION IN METHICILLIN RESISTANT STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS (MRSA) ISOLATES
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors fail to clearly mention the research question and the objectives of the study. It is not clear if they examined the protease activity only in MRSA or all <i>S. aureus</i> isolates. This could be because of poor presentation, but it must be addressed. 2. In the sub-section "sample collection" of the section "materials and methods" they mentioned, "Exclusion criteria included samples collected before antibiotic therapy." Why do they exclude the samples collected before antibiotic therapy? 3. Incubation conditions are mentioned nowhere in the manuscript, neither for AST nor for protease activity. Time and temperature significantly affect the result and, therefore, must be clearly mentioned. 4. The "Methods" section says that the authors employed the disc-diffusion method to screen MRSA and are using oxacillin to screen MRSA! While screening MRSA (mecA mediated) with oxacillin, CLSI suggests the "broth microdilution or agar dilution" method, not the disc-diffusion. The authors have not mentioned the µg content of the antibiotics. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Another issue with this manuscript is the poor presentation of data and/or logic that makes the manuscript difficult to comprehend. The abstract and most of the body of the manuscript should be revised. 2. It is suggested that authors go through the manuscript for other detailed comments. 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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> Because this research involves human subjects, ethical approval from a regulatory agency is required before it can be carried out, (which is not mentioned in the manuscript). Furthermore, the authors make no mention of obtaining patients' informed consent. Any exceptions to this ethical requirement must be stated.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anil Pokhrel
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal