
SCIENCEDOMAIN international





SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
The authors did not check the text and English grammar carefully	We carefully reviewed all the required changes, please refer to the
enough. Also, not all names of microorganisms are written in	revised manuscript. We hope that now our manuscript is ready to be
italics. The goals and purpose of this paper are not written in the	published in your respected journal
introductory part. Improvements are needed in the material and	
methods in terms of evidence of microorganisms. The references	
have not been updated, nor has the discussion been expanded to	
support the purpose and aim of the research. I would not accept	
the author's explanation that they will consider the discussion	
method in future studies.	
Personally, I think that 45 samples of swabs over 3 months and	
from three hospitals is not enough basis for comparing the results	
and making a correct conclusion.	
It would be nice if the authors would make additional efforts to	
expand their research, inform us about the methods of isolation	
and determination of certain bacterial species (the ISO method or	
the method that is known from the scientific literature) and	
certainly compare their results with the results of similar research	
of more recent dates.	
or more recent dates.	
	1

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.5 (4th August, 2012)