



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_55027
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinico-Microbiological profile of Chronic Osteomyelitis in a Tertiary care Hospital of North India
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A major problem that should be emphasised in this study is the diagnosis of osteomyelitis. The authors have mentioned that the types of samples include pus; a swab culture, synovial fluid other than the standard practice is to prove it by the bone biopsy and culture. The validity of using other samples than bone biopsy cultures might give false diagnosis of the organisms including colonizers especially with swab cultures. Authors have failed to mention the clinical characteristics of the patient at the time of diagnosis since osteomyelitis is not only a diagnosis by the isolation of organisms but with the clinical profile and radiological findings of the patient. And also it would be noteworthy to mention the input from the treating physicians or surgeons regarding the diagnosis of osteomyelitis and radiologists support for interpretation of images. 2. By including all age groups, the study shows a predominance of patients of the age below 20 years. The risk factors and microbiological profile of these patients are very different and the generalizability of the results would be inappropriate unless authors change the topic of the article. Also the authors can give a sub group analysis according to the age groups regarding predominant bacteria and sensitivity pattern than giving a general picture of the study group. 3. Majority of the involved bones seems to be lower limb long bones and it reflects the bias of the study towards young age group with road traffic accidents and associated osteomyelitis as mentioned by the authors and the microbiological profile in that group varies with many factors such as degree of the initial soft tissue injury and the degree of contamination etc. And foot bones (i.e metatarsals) are only involved in 12% and one of the common cause of diabetes associated osteomyelitis seems to be not reflected properly in this study population. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Figure 2 and 3 charts are not very clear because of the graphics used by the authors.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oshan Basnayake
Department, University & Country	University of Colombo, Sri Lanka