

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_110928
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiogram of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Clinical Isolates Tested for Pan, Extensive and Multidrug Resistances
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript on the "Antibiogram of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Clinical Isolates Tested for Pan, Extensive and Multidrug Resistances" can be considered important for the scientific community, particularly in the field of microbiology and antimicrobial resistance.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>While the abstract covers essential aspects of the study, it could benefit from a slight reduction in length. Consider trimming unnecessary details to maintain brevity while retaining crucial information</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not exactly</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Need to revise</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the study refers to global antibiotic resistance concerns, a more explicit acknowledgment of the global impact and efforts to address antimicrobial resistance could strengthen the introduction 2. The study period (September 2017 to July 2019) is mentioned, but further clarification on why this specific timeframe was chosen and whether any external factors may have influenced the results would be beneficial 3. suggests commenting on the lack of specific details related to the definitions of MDR, XDR, and PDR and the selection process 4. why not use any E test 5. The methodology section provides a detailed account of the study design, sample collection, and laboratory techniques used for microbial identification and antibiotic susceptibility testing. 6. Quality Control: The inclusion of quality control measures, such as the use of P. aeruginosa ATCC 27853, enhances the reliability of the study results. 7. While the results are well-presented, avoid introducing interpretative elements in this section. Reserve interpretation and discussion for the dedicated discussion section 8. Consider providing a more in-depth analysis of factors contributing to the observed resistance patterns. Are there specific local practices, environmental factors, or patient demographics that may explain the findings? 9. Consider including a brief section on potential future directions for research or interventions based on the study's outcomes. 	

[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:	Patil Sandip Shriapti
Department, University & Country	Shenzhen Children's Hospital, China