

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_109297
Title of the Manuscript:	Multidrug Resistance in Klebsiella species Isolated from Liquid Herbal Remedies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Yes, it is</p> <p>Yes, it is</p> <p>No, it is not. I don't understand this sentence (Pre-isolated Klebsiella isolates numbering 109, recovered from 288 samples of thirty six different liquid herbal medicines to ascertain the prevalence of multidrug resistance (MDR) strains.). The abstract structure is unusual. Is it suggested by editor?</p> <p>Yes, it is</p> <p>No, it is not. It needs more information about the reason choosing the set of antibiotic to test Klebsiella resistance. Is the author find that liquid herbal contain resistant bacteria? Is the government allowing this product distributed in public? Is there any regulation about liquid herbal quality assurance before distributed in the society? The author should discuss every data. There are four tables. The conclusion not from the study.</p> <p>Yes, it is</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fauna Herawati
Department, University & Country	University of Surabaya, Indonesia