Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_87644**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of the Diversity Bacterial in wounds of Burn patients Hospitalized in Major Hospitals in Aba, Abia 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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	1. Please clarify, whether the appropriate ethical clearance was taken for undertaking this research. 2. There are many grammatical/ typographical errors, which need to be corrected. 3. The scientific names are not written properly in many cases. 4. The methodology is too brief and lacks clarity. 5. How many samples were collected? How was the isolation of bacteria carried out (like which media and culture conditions were used)? How were the bacteria identified? 6. The title '**Evaluation of the Diversity Bacterial in wounds of Burn patients Hospitalized in Major Hospitals in Aba, Abia State, Nigeria'** is inappropriate. Kindly Revise it to **Evaluation of the Bacterial Diversity in wounds of Burn patients Hospitalized in Major Hospitals in Aba, Abia State, Nigeria'** 7. Kindly Explain the results properly. The authors have simply incorporated a table in results section and no explanation or interpretation is provided. 8. The authors have repeatedly written 'haemoltic', which should be 'hemolytic'. 9. What is meant by frequency? For e.g., if the frequency of Klebsiella is 14 (as mentioned in the table), what does it mean. How many samples were tested, out of which Klebsiella were present in 14? 10. Wasn't there any case where more than one type of bacteria were present? 11. The references cited in the text are quite old. The latest relevant references need to be incorporated.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript cannot be published in the present form. However, if the authors make the appropriate improvements, the same may be considered as a short communication.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* Yes. The authors are taking swab samples from patients in burn wards of hospitals. So, clarify, whether the appropriate ethical clearance was taken for undertaking this research.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Chayanika Putatunda**
Department, University & Country	**Om Sterling Global University, India**