

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_100694
Title of the Manuscript:	Emergence of third generation tetracyclines: New magic bullets to tackle antibiotic resistance in the post-antibiotic era
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	  1. <b>Yes. The tetracycline antibiotic class has acquired new valuable members due to the optimisation of the chemical structure. The first modern tetracycline introduced into therapy was tigecycline, followed by omadacycline, eravacycline, and sarecycline (the third generation). The present review focuses on their safety, efficacy, and therapeutic choices of new tetracyclines.</b>  2. <b>Yes</b> 3. <b>Yes</b> 4. <b>Yes</b> 5. <b>Yes</b> 6. <b>Yes</b>  <b>See the attachment</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	  1. I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style.	
<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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Igna Cornel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine, Romania</b>