

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_105059
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE KLEBSIELLA SPECIES ISOLATED FROM CLINICAL SAMPLES IN A TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL, SOUTH, GOA, INDIA
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://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is relevant, as it has as its theme an important public health problem.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The abstract is fine, but needs improve the writing of results and insert one small conclusion.</p> <p>4. The topics "limitations of the research", "scope for future work" and "review of literature" are unnecessary, if there is any relevant information for the work that cannot be left out, it will be inserted in the other topics of the manuscript; The objective topic must be inserted at the end of the introduction (last paragraph). I suggest that topic "conclusion" be written in a continuous way, avoiding subtopics.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript has a coherent scientific logic.</p> <p>6. Outdated references, preferably articles from the last 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always written scientific names using the international norms, use italic, for example. • The first time you write an acronym in the text, you have to describe it. • Insert references after the phrases cited. • Improve the layout of the tables. • Why has <i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. resistance in the statistical method? Isn't just the genus <i>Klebsiella</i> investigated? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Writing can improve.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript is very good, but it need to improve on several points. The authors needs to review and improve all the points mentioned above for his article to continue in the publication process.	

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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rafael Machado de Araújo Alves
Department, University & Country	University Federal of Paraíba, Brazil