AUTHOR'S RESPONSE

I am very glad to receive feedback from our respected colleague as it proves the interest taken by them in JPMI and also gives us a chance to clarify various issues related to our article. To start with, I would like to give the background of the whole scenario. We in our department practically involve our college students (4th year MBBS and now clinical students i.e. 3rd – final year) to work on various projects batch wise which is mandatory. We also help them as individuals and as groups (as well as postgraduate students) to work on projects of their interest and to prepare it for publication.

My respected colleague has said in his statement that the article is fabricated and whole manuscript is concocted which is false. During the summer vacations my students approached the said department, to obtain the data but were refused and were asked to bring a permission letter from the higher authorities of the hospital. They approached medical superintendent / administrator of LRH and a written application was submitted and duly signed by the captioned authority which was provided to the concerned staff who gave the data on couple of visits.

The whole data was then divided roughly into four portions. The entry, compilation and analysis were done by my students on 04 separate computers using SPSS Version 16.0. Finally the paper was checked by me and then I allowed them to submit the article in the Journal of the same hospital as to my knowledge and satisfaction, all ethical issues were addressed.

My name as principal author is due to the respect given to me by my students for supervising them in their publication / peer reviews etc. However names of the member/ teaching staff of the said department was not included/ overlooked in the paper un-intentionally/ unfortunately as they were not taken on board by my students for which I duly apologize on behalf of them and myself for this ethical consideration. I agree with the observation that practically my students have not performed any of the tests in the concerned laboratory as it is only a retrospective study on the data provided by the lab staff and is not a requirement/ mandatory in such kind of studies.

It is true that the comparison of MSSA and MRSA has not been done in this study. In fact a general pattern of sensitivity resistance of Staphylococcus aureus has been derived. Few technical points raised by the colleague regarding methodology specifically McConkey's media /CLSI guidelines and other issues are for interest of the readers and are the result of the discussion / communication between my students and staff of the laboratory and not specific to Staphylococcus aureus only but gives a general view of culture and sensitivity practices.

As the data received from the laboratory was analyzed as such therefore, we cannot blame my students nor the staff for what is done / not done to find the sensitivity of Staphylococcus aureus, but the truth / hard fact is, this is what was provided in the data and analyzed by the students under my supervision. The results published in the

article are in accordance with the information provided by the data from the laboratory.

One very important point which I would like to raise is about the peer review and editorial review; these points were not raised by the authorities analyzing the paper. However, it is to inform the concerned worthy colleague of the Microbiology Department, LRH that some more data of their department is in the process of analysis and will be shared with the concerned authorities. I will make sure in future that the people working in the laboratory are taken on

board to avoid any misunderstanding/discrepancies.

REFERENCES

1. N Muhammad, Adil M, Naz SM, Abbas SH, Khan MZUI, et al. Resistance and sensitivity pattern of Staphylococcus aureus; A study in Lady Reading Hospital Peshawar. J Postgrad Med Inst 2013;27:42-7.

Dr. Muhammad Naeem,

Department of Community Medicine, Khyber Medical College, Peshawar - Pakistan E-mail: eaglebook86@gmail.com