SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Microbiology Research Journal International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_MRJI_59395**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Epidemiology of bacterial contamination of inert hospital surfaces and equipment in critical and non-critical care units: a Brazilian study**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Good work, meticulously executed but sample size is too small for a epidemiological study. Try to resubmit with a bigger sample size and also avoid disparity in the number of samples collected.	The resubmit of the manuscript with a larger sample size will not be possible since we will not be able to continue with samples collection, especially considering the current pandemic situation. The disparities in the sample number can be reduced (in relation to Hospital B) by observing the data presented in another work developed by our team at the same hospital B (article submitted and under review in the Global Journal of Medical Research (ISSN: 2249- 4618), entitled: "Risk factors for oropharyngeal colonization with multidrug-resistant bacteria in a Brazilian hospital") (data presented in the article - reference 49). In the patients' oropharynx, *S.aureus* was also one of the main microorganisms found, as well as in this environmental study and MRSA was found at a higher frequency (71.4%) than that found in this environmental study (58.3%) considering only hospital B . This correlation provides support, robustness and confidence to the results presented in this article being evaluated.

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)*	