

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Good

Remarks

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Good

Remarks

any comment

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Good

Remarks

any comment

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Regular

Remarks

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Good

Remarks

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Good

Remarks

any comment

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Good

Remarks

any comment

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Regular

Remarks

1 Reference are in mixed format

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Acceptable

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

any comment

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

Remarks

The study identifies risk factors for both MRSA and MSSA, however only MRSA is mentioned in the title. Although I understand that the problem bacteria is MRSA, the title is not fully descriptive of the study.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Good

Remarks

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Regular

Remarks

It is confusing to read from lines 39 to 53, it should be written again, risk factors for MRSA such as cephalosporins and fluoroquinolones (line 40) are described and in line 43, recent use of antibiotics, that could be written in a single paragraph. Risk factors in HIV patients should be written more concisely since it is not the specific study population.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Good

Remarks

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Good

Remarks

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Remarks

The study data is prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, where the massive use of antibiotics changed the profiles of bacterial resistance. That should be discussed and placed in the conclusions, as perhaps the risk factors and resistance profiles currently may be different.

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Remarks

The study data is prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, where the massive use of antibiotics changed the profiles of bacterial resistance. That should be discussed and placed in the conclusions, as perhaps the risk factors and resistance profiles currently may be different.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Good

Remarks

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Acceptable

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it



It is an interesting article and it provides data on MRSA infections in a region where these data are scarce; Unfortunately, the data is prior to the pandemic, where the massive use of antibiotics changed the profiles of bacterial resistance.

Dear Editor of the MIC Review,

I am writing to inform you that we have addressed all the observations made by Reviewer A and Reviewer C in their respective reviews. Specifically, we have made improvements to the methodology section to provide a clearer description of the procedure, methods, and techniques used in data collection and analysis. Additionally, we have updated the references to comply with the Vancouver format.

Regarding Reviewer A's comments, we have taken note of the regular quality of bibliographic references and have made the necessary changes to ensure that they meet the Vancouver format. We have also taken note of the mixed format of one reference.

As for Reviewer C's comments, we made revisions to the introduction and discussion sections to provide more concise descriptions of the risk factors and resistance profiles.

We hope that these revisions will be satisfactory, and we thank the reviewers and the editorial team for their valuable feedback.

Best regards,