

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_103073
Title of the Manuscript:	Dialysis Central Venous Catheter–Associated Sepsis: Complimentary Role of Local Susceptibility Pattern
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalijmpcr.com/index.php/IJMPCR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Dialysis-Associated Central Venous Catheter Sepsis: The Supportive Role of Local Susceptibility Pattern</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes , but need to some updated references (2020 to 2023) almost are 2006 to 2016.</p> <p>Yes accepted with some updated references .</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes ,</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Great to hear that I found the article generally well-written. Regarding the conclusion, I propose expanding on future potential. Discussing probable consequences, trends, or developments from the issue will deepen the piece and offer readers a direction. Insight into prospective future research, advancement, or practical applications might help readers comprehend the relevance of the results or ideas described. Including these aspects in the conclusion makes the piece more complete and thought-provoking.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Neelesh Kumar Maurya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>NIILM University, India</b>