

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_103230
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical and bacteriological relevance of procalcitonin: a single center, retrospective observational study.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>The article has highlighted diagnostic and prognostic importance of the simple test and also as a diagnostic stewardship test can provisionally think of sepsis with Gram positive or gram negative organism and choose the appropriate empirical antibiotic based on hospital antibiotic policy so that it will help in taking a step towards containment of global burning issue of Anti Microbial Resistance.</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes, well written.</b>  <b>Satisfactory</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is scientifically very well structured and written. I found that in page no 2 in introduction section 4 <sup>th</sup> line the word lung is repeated which may be deleted.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anuradha K</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mysore Medical College &amp; Research Institute, India</b>