

Review of: "Nasal Carriage of Staphylococcus aureus and Antibigram among Medical Undergraduate Students of a Private University in Ogun State, Nigeria"

Dr. Manal Hadi Kanaan

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The article is well written and has covered nasal carriage and antimicrobial resistance of *Staphylococcus aureus* and among medical undergraduate students of a private university in Ogun State in Nigeria.

Title: The authors referred to the investigation of the Antibigram of *Staphylococcus aureus*, while the study investigated the resistance to antimicrobials and not the resistance profiles, so the title needs to replace Antibigram with antimicrobial resistance for more clarity.

Abstract: Please re-arrange the keywords alphabetically.

Materials and methodology: The authors did not indicate the catalog number for the media used.

The antibiotics used are limited and refer to only four classes, while *Staphylococcus aureus* has a high resistance to most classes of antimicrobials.

The methods used for isolation and diagnosis are traditional and I do not think that they can be adopted as a confirmed diagnosis of MRSA. It was assumed that more selective media should be used such as Baird-Parker agar with identifications kits such as Electronic RapIDTM Staph Plus Diagnostic Code Compendium Panel System (ERIC®), Dryspot Staphytest Plus (DR0100), Penicillin Binding Protein (PBP2') Plus (DR0900) These kits can detect specific proteins and enzymes specific to MRSA, and are usually less expensive than PCR.

The authors indicated that the isolate was classified as either "resistant" or "sensitive." They did not imply the intermediate. Why?

Results: Table 5, the authors indicated the patterns of resistance, while the table shows the data analysis of the antibiotic susceptibility test and there are no profiles of resistance, so the title of the table should be rewritten as: Data analysis of the antibiotic susceptibility test of *S. aureus* isolates according to the participants' department.

Grammar: Need Some revision to the manuscript.

General comments:

In general, the paper is well written, and the manuscript is relevant and informative.

Abstract: The abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand.

Introduction: The authors provide sufficient context on the subject.

Conclusion: The research offers sample data for the authors to draw conclusions from.

The article is well written and suitable for publication, after addressing the above comments.



Best regards