

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_96775
Title of the Manuscript:	Emergence of Raoultella ornithinolytica producing beta lactamase enzyme in different clinical specimens in Erbil city
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.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific community because the bacteria causes serious infections and susceptibility to some antibiotics are low 2. Yes , the title of the article is suitable 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. Yes, most of the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate: The manuscript has no conclusion (although it does appear in the abstract) 5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct 6. Most of the references are sufficient and recent, but have some citation mistakes that I marked in yellow: (The author can find the abbreviated names of the journals in Pubmed) I marked in blue the references that are not recent, that I suggest the author change.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Grettchen Flores Sandi
Department, University & Country	University of Costa Rica, Costa Rica