

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_88286
Title of the Manuscript:	RESISTANT PROFILING OF MYCOBACTERIUM STRAINS CAUSING CLUSTER PULMONARY INFECTION IN BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the 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.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Even though the idea sounds interesting, there are many important points that need clarification, refinement, reanalysis, rewriting and more information to improve this article. There are many questions that require answers in the design of this study. The abstract, introduction, design, description of results, and discussion need to be improved to achieve this purpose.</p> <p><b>Major points</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is an arduous read. The manuscript needs extensive writing and language editing. The title should improve. It would be better to "Resistance profile of Mycobacterial strains causing cluster pulmonary infection in Nigeria". The main objective must be direct and the same throughout the manuscript (abstract, introduction, results/discussion) "The main aim of this study is to obtain the resistance profile of tuberculous and nontuberculous Mycobacterial strains causing cluster pulmonary infection in Bayelsa State, Nigeria." The abstract should be rewritten and highlight the main points of this study. Authors should not use the words that appear in the title as keywords. The first time an abbreviation appears, the full name must be entered. References should be recent and relevant, and their use throughout the manuscript should be improved.</li> <li>2. The introduction section is a bit poor and should be improved. It is unclear about what the authors know about this topic. First, the authors should start by describing why TB is a critical illness, then what problems occur with its treatment (multi-resistance, etc.), and in the end, why this study is essential to improve knowledge of this disease. The first paragraph must be the last, and the third paragraph must be the first. The research question should be clearly outlined. A good and clear justification for conducting this study should be given. It would be better if the authors offered a hypothesis before the main objective of this study.</li> <li>3. The materials and methods section are poor and needs to be improved. The description must be clear, concise, and detailed. The authors must declare that this study was carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (ethical considerations). This section does not provide enough detail on the study design for it to be replicable. The description of the study design should be more detailed, it would be a good idea to use subsections, such as Population study, Ethical considerations, Sampling, Resistance study, Culture study, Statistical analysis, etc. Some of the information described here can be used in the introduction section. How many locations did the participants come from? What statistical analysis program did the authors use?</li> <li>4. The results and discussion sections should be separate. The crossed-out information should be used in the discussion section. In addition, there is information that should be written in the material and method section.</li> <li>5. In the results section, the figures need to improve their quality. In the text, repeating the results presented through tables should be avoided. It should be clear what were the most significant results of this study?</li> <li>6. The discussion should improve and be more argumentative. This section should start with the main objective of this study and the most significant results. The results must be discussed from multiple angles and placed in context without being over-interpreted. Are there similar national or international studies that help compare their results on TB resistance? A paragraph of limitations and suggestions (what appear in the conclusion section) should be written before the conclusion.</li> <li>7. The conclusion should improve and should be like the abstract.</li> </ol> <p>I encourage the authors to rewrite the manuscript, thinking about the principal goal of this study, its design and answering with the results and arguments of the discussion the most proper conclusion to this research work.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	They are underlined in the accompanying manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**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>Marlene Fabiola Escobedo Monge</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Valladolid University, Spain</b>