

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2626
Title of the Manuscript:	Pathogen detection on inanimate surfaces in healthcare institutions: Phenotype incubation methods and molecular methods
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript gives valuable information about method for detection of microorganism involving in nosocomial infection. The method comparing direct approach (culture dependent) and indirect approach (culture independent). Several research have been given as an example of each approach to support the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of article is suitable. However, maybe author could consider about using “phenotype incubation method” because as the comparison, the terminology “genotype” should be used instead of “molecular character”.	
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 is comprehensive, however the subsection in the abstract need to be revised. Especially in the method subsection (please look at recommendation in the manuscript).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsection of the manuscript should be revised. For the literature review or book section, you should not put “method” subsection. Just elaborate the result of your literature review in form of result subsection.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The description about pathogen detection method is supported by several relevant reference. However, some graph especially which involving the enumeration of microorganism should be revised (please look at the recommendation in the manuscript).	
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	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General 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:	I Gde Adi Suryawan Wangiyana
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika, Indonesia