

Review of: "[Review Article] Review of *Streptococcus pyogenes*"

Cesar Marcial Escobedo-Bonilla¹

¹ Instituto Politécnico Nacional

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer Comments

QEIOS

Manuscript title: [Review Article] Review of *Streptococcus pyogenes*

General comment: The manuscript deals with a brief review on *Streptococcus pyogenes* pathogenicity, severity of infection and nosocomial importance. Although the subject is important given the emergence of nosocomial bacterial diseases, the manuscript may be improved upon a thorough revision. It is suggested to include numbering of lines in continuous form throughout the manuscript to make it easy to point out a specific correction.

In abstract, this section seems vague, incomplete and repeated use of words is obvious. It is suggested that a broader abstract is written describing the main features of the review and include the conclusion of it.

In the section Introduction, review of English as in the whole document is encouraged. Change the word Scientific for the word Taxonomic where the taxonomic position of the species is presented. It is suggested to include a connector between the taxonomic section with the previous one. It does not show continuity between them, and the change is abrupt.

The section "general characteristics of the microorganism", the word "microorganism" should be deleted and the species name be used instead.

Section C. A deeper take should be given to the pathogenesis and virulence of the bacterium and the enzymes involved in these processes.

Section D variation should indicate phenotypic variations such as virulence, antibiotic resistance and so on caused by presence/acquisition of plasmids. On the other hand, it should be noted the presence of genetic variation caused by uptake/insertions of foreign genes/DNA. This section may contain other sources of variation within the species.

In general, the review may be improved by making it broader in its sections and connecting each section to the next in a coherent way. It is suggested that the review be divided into major sections such as: Morphology, Biology, Pathogenicity and Virulence traits (toxins, enzymes, etc.), Phenotypic and Genetic Variability, Antigenic features and serotypes, Isolation and Culture, Clinical features and health importance, Diagnostic methods to detect the pathogen, etc.

Also, addition of pictures of high quality of the isolated bacterium, colony growth in different culture media, genetic/genomic maps or sequences, etc. may help to improve the review.