

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4553
Title of the Manuscript:	Biotyping of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus Isolated from Poultry Meat Sold in Wasit Markets of Iraq
Type of the Article	Original research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the growing public health concern surrounding methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) strains in food sources, particularly in poultry. By identifying distinct MRSA biotypes from raw and frozen chicken meat, it underscores the potential risks these pathogens pose to human health. Furthermore, the study employs a clear biotyping methodology, contributing valuable data that can inform further research and biosecurity measures in food production. The findings also highlight the need for improved management practices in animal husbandry to mitigate the spread of MRSA,	Thank you very much for your comments

	thus promoting better public health outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thank you very much for your comments
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	Thank you very much for your comments. We addressed all reviewer comment
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, but errors related to them are mentioned in the review form.	Thank you very much for your comments

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Almost	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keywords in a research article should not be abbreviations. Please write full words of the MRSA. “minus 80 degrees Celsius” and “24 hours” “four degrees Celsius” should be written in numbers and abbreviated units. The English needs to be improved. According to Soltan Dallal et al. (2010), correct number should be written in “seventeen of them pertained to the human ecovar”. The corrected reference (Isigidi, BK; Mathieu, AM; Devriese, LA; Godard, C and Hoof, JV (1992). <i>Enterotoxin production in different Staphylococcus aureus biotypes isolated from food and meat plants. J. Appl. Bacteriol.</i>, 72: 16-20.) for “Despite the fact that certain studies discovered that there were no differences between the human strains and the NHS isolates in terms of their capacity to produce sickness (Maktabi et al., 2021)” should be written. The correct percents should be written in “Sample contamination with HS species was 76.33% and with 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you very much for your comments. Done. Thank you very much for your comments. Done. Thank you very much for your comments. Done. Thank you very much for your comments. Done. Thank you very much for your comments. Done. Thank you very much for your comments. Done. Thank you very much for your comments. Done (reference removed) Thank you very much for your

	<p>NHS species it was 23.17% in this investigation”.</p> <p>7. Although you referenced “Cruha et al. (2011)” in the manuscript, it is not in the references. Also, this reference seems to be a mistake. There is no such reference.</p> <p>8. The correct reference (Soltan Dallal et al., 2010) in “In particular, a number of studies have shed light on the prevalence of a number of parameters that are implicated in staphylococcal poisoning among the human ecovar (Maktabi et al., 2021)” should be referred.</p>	<p>comments. Done.</p>
--	---	------------------------

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	