

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Research Perspectives of Microbiology and Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2332
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial Prevalence and Antimicrobial Resistance in Children and Adolescents with Chronic Rhinosinusitis in South Indian Population
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1:ReviewComments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It ismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think it is important since although it has been widely studied, there are still controversies about its etiology. The identification of the causative microbiology must also be clarified. On the other hand, the population studied is from a particular area and it is worth contrasting it with populations from other countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think it's right with the content.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do yousuggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Pleasewriteyour suggestions here.	If I think it's a bit long. And I think it could be reduced to 350 words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I have no objection to the structure, I think it is correct.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work covers the question posed, and the methodology used to find the aforementioned results was well done. There are some shortcomings in the presentation of results, but technically I think they are fine. I think that a refinement in his writing style and defining some acronyms would increase the interest of readers. Specialized and non-specialized.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	I think they are enough, but I would recommend you to cite some more recent ones. (2020 – 2023)	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I think that, if you need to improve the language, try to make it more scientific. The whole writing is understandable, but for some non-specialists, it might seem a little confusing.	
Optional/General comments	In general, I think it is a good study, of scientific and epidemiological interest. It has some spelling errors, but which are correctable. With regard to the presentation of results, it seems to me that the tables should be improved, because the use of percentages, of the total. Sometimes they are confused with particular percentages of that percentage: for example, children are 47.3% of 188, and then when it says 51.6% of children, it refers to the percentage of 47.3? On the other hand, if the tables need to be improved. Those are my comments.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arturo Araujo Conejo
Department, University & Country	Hospital General Zacatecas del IMSS Bienestar, Mexico