

GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRMMS_1620
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND PATTERN OF EXTENDED SPECTRUM BETA-LACTAMASES (ESBL) PRODUCING Klebsiella pneumoniae IN BIOLOGICAL SPECIMEN AT A TERTIARY HOSPITAL
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://globalpresshub.com/index.php/AJRMMS/editorial-policy)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1(10-04-2018)



GPH Review Form

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?		
(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes, this manuscript could be important for the scientific community in the African area, but not only!	
2. Is the title of the article suitable?	2. The title wants to be suitable but is too	
(If not please suggest an alternative title)	general it must be better circumscribed.	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	3. The Abstract is acceptable in this form	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	4. The introduction is too frugal, the authors must introduce a phrase or two about the causes generating "a dramatic increase of ESBLs among clinical isolated" and what	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	isthe real dimension of ESBL since it "has emerged creating a gradual global challenge in both the healthcare settings	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	and local communities". The M & M subsection must be developed in the description of 2.2., 2.3. and 2.4. Please describe	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	synthetically the methodology here and not only state that "according to standardmethods". This part has to be replicable!	
	5. If the up-mentioned parts will be corrected, then YES	
	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent, but must be uniformized after the Journal's instructions.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable	
Optional/General comments	It is an average-quality manuscript because the M&M part is not well conceived.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1(10-04-2018)



GPH Review Form

2: Ethical issues

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) NO
----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Romeo Teodor Cristina
Department, University & Country	USV "King Michael I" of Timisoara, Romania

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1(10-04-2018)