

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101824
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic and genotypic detection of carbapenem resistant nosocomial infection in patients attending tertiary care hospital
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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. Yes, Carbapenamases are now increasingly becoming a public health emergency with a large number of Gram negative organisms developing resistance to all available antibiotics resulting in both poor clinical outcomes as well as increased economic impact with prolonged hospital stay.</p> <p>2. The title can be modified to Carbapenem resistant organisms causing nosocomial infections...</p> <p>3. Abstract has to be modified as there are language corrections to be made.</p> <p>4. OK</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Ok</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	NO	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are a number of grammatical errors, and sentence construction mistakes which make the text difficult to understand at places. Organism's names have been spelled incorrectly and need to be corrected.</p> <p>Though the work done is relevant and extensive, the poor language of the article makes it unfit for scientific publication, in the present format. The discussion is also difficult to understand as numerous studies have been quoted but proper comparisons have not been made.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shereen Rachel Varghese
Department, University & Country	Christian Medical College & Hospital, India