

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_127887
Title of the Manuscript:	Case Report of a Patient with Burkholderia cepacia Urinary Tract Infection with Prostatitis and Prostatic Micro abscess.
Type of the Article	Case report

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>The study is based on a short responding participant, which makes it of a little low interest for the readers, as the case studies are based on a large number of data and statistical analysis. Anyhow the scientific approach and topic of this study seems alright.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes, the title is satisfactory</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>It's upon the author's consent if the abstract could have a little more scientific details of the infectious agent, infection statistics and more evidences of patients.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<b>Not too much, as very few evidences of the scientific findings of study is making it least interesting.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>No, they are not according to me, adding more references can add valuable reading content with scientific evidences.</b>	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>It needs improvement</b>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>	<b>More data and comparative analysis of the infectious diseases other the reported organism can make it worthy for the readers. Discussion should be a little more explanatory.</b>	

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Faryal Anjum</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science and Technology, Pakistan</b>