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

Hala A.A. Abou-Zeina[1]

1 National Research Center, Egypt

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of Streptococcus pyogenes

The review addresses an intriguing issue, particularly in light of the recent increase in *Streptococcus pyogenes* infections. However, the review does not adequately address the aims to understand the causes of *S. pyogenes*, nor does it give a full scientific review of the pathogen, virulence factors, infections, and so on. It adds nothing new to the already extensive research on *S. pyogenes*.

The abstract is ambiguous and incomplete, with noticeable repetition of terms. It is advised that a longer abstract is required that describes the key points of the review and includes its conclusion.

Furthermore, there are a lot of repetitions in the text, and some mentioned references are unrelated (e.g., ref 2 is for the Thalassemia gene disease, reference 4 is for hepatitis C, reference 5 is for *Citrobacter koseri*, and reference 10 is for the HIV virus).

The conclusion is quite inadequate and poorly established; there is no discussion of vaccinations in clinical trials or effective antibiotic usage.

The references are written in a haphazard manner. There are references lacking page numbers such as ref. 2, 14,...etc., and others missed the journal such as ref. 19, 26, 27, 31, and 34.

I recommend revising the topic using sophisticated analysis or researching additional dimensions to increase scientific depth and impact.

In general, the review might be better by expanding its parts and connecting one section to the next in a consistent manner. The review should be divided into major sections such as Morphology, Biology, Pathogenicity and Virulence traits, Phenotypic and Genetic Variability, Antigenic features and serotypes, Isolation and Culture, Clinical features and health importance, Diagnostic methods to detect the pathogen, and vaccination .

Additionally, high-quality images of the isolated bacteria, colony development in different culture mediums, sequences, and so on may assist in improving the scientific value.

In conclusion, the paper is unacceptable for publishing.