

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58734

Title: Prevalence and Phenotypic Characterisation of Methicillin Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Isolated from Respiratory Tract Infections

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

1. The topic is clinically relevant and important.
2. A variety of respiratory specimens were included.
3. Standard culture and biochemical methods were used.
4. Cefoxitin disc diffusion was used for MRSA screening.
5. Ethical approval from an Institutional Ethics Committee is reported.
6. Quality control procedures and CLSI criteria are mentioned.
7. The study provides useful preliminary data on phenotypic MRSA detection.

Weakness of the study:

1. There are major inconsistencies in the reported number of isolates.
2. The study population and sampling procedure are not clearly described.
3. The reported MRSA prevalence needs clearer calculation and presentation.
4. Molecular confirmation of MRSA was not performed.
5. Several results and tables require better organization.
6. The manuscript contains frequent grammar and formatting errors.
7. Some interpretations are stronger than the data support.

Reviewer's Comments:

The manuscript addresses an important clinical microbiology problem and provides useful information on phenotypic detection of MRSA from respiratory specimens. The use of culture, Gram staining, catalase, coagulase and cefoxitin testing is appropriate, and the authors report that ethical approval was obtained from an Institutional Ethics Committee. However, the manuscript has important methodological and reporting problems. There are inconsistencies in the number of isolates, with 200 clinical samples, 240 isolates, 280 isolates and later 158 confirmed *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates being reported at different sections. This needs careful correction. The study also relies mainly on phenotypic identification without molecular confirmation. The age and gender results are presented as MRSA patients even though the denominator appears to be the total study population. Grammar, spelling, formatting and sentence construction require substantial editing. The overall study has value, but the methodological inconsistencies must be resolved before publication.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to present original laboratory findings, and no clear statement of previous publication or duplicate publication is provided. However, the manuscript contains some unusual text and inconsistent reporting that should be carefully checked against the original laboratory records. A formal plagiarism and similarity check should be conducted by the journal before acceptance.