

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_103469
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of in- vitro activity of Cefixime to Doxycycline and Minocycline against Gram-negative bacteria isolated from Patients Suffering from Respiratory Tract Infections at a Tertiary Care Centre in Northern India
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Authors propose study aimed to analyze the comparative in-vitro activity of Cefixime and Tetracyclines by antibiotic susceptibility testing (AST) against the pathogens isolated from respiratory samples. The aim of paper appears clear and good treated in the abstract as good resumed in the title of manuscript. References are appropriate, relevant but may be improved with more recent in literature. Introduction is complete, treating just known matters in literature. Good explication of matter with functional chapters organization.</p> <p>Data are presented in an appropriate way. Tables and figures are relevant and clearly.</p> <p>Discussion of treated matter is just performed in coherent way, without being overinterpreted.</p> <p>Good is the readability and links with other up-dated review on the same matter treated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Concetto Sessa
Department, University & Country	"Maggiore" Hospital, Modica, Ragusa, Italy