

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_102048
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Resistance Profile of Different Clinical Isolates against Augmentin, Imipenem and Ceftriaxone.
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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>1- Yes, the topic is one of the most important points of research in many African countries My thanks for authors for their great topic choice and their good work</p> <p>2- The title is appropriate to the research article giving the reader a pit inserting hint about the paper work idea.</p> <p>3- No, it is short. My suggestions to authors are to write few sentences regarding antimicrobial resistance towards antibiotics and its results besides the benefits of antibiotic judgmental use.</p> <p>4- All subsections are ordered, organized correctly following the scientific criteria of paper research article writing. However, in discussion subsection, it was preferred to report or give more explanation with more focusing on significant result if presented in the study. Also, in results part, pie chart or diagram will be more discussable for the reader rather than tables</p> <p>5- According to the data provided, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- References are sufficient but not recent. Dear authors, you have to write them acc.to the international guidelines for publishing paper or research article, all of the references need updating by reading and searching more.</p> <p>**Regarding table 1</p> <p>Total percentage should be 100%</p> <p>Revise your results all over the manuscript.</p> <p>** where is the significant results obtained to be highlighted for more explanations in discussion</p> <p>Try to make more comparisons to explore your results clearly.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Quality of English language is very good with minor revision:-</p> <p>-Revise your punctuation(brackets and comma mainly)</p> <p>-try to use different linking words to avoid meaning repetition</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I did not get the issue goal for making two separate studies , give a brief hint for this</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shimaa Mahmoud Abdel-Latif Shabayek
Department, University & Country	Al-Azhar University "Girls", Egypt