

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_119538
Title of the Manuscript:	A PROSPECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY TO ASSESS THE PRESCRIPTION PATTERN OF ANTIBIOTICS IN INTENSIVE CARE UNIT AT TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. In the article I received, the authors refer to a very important problem: bacterial resistance to antibiotics and rational antibiotic therapy. My everyday experience shows that despite high awareness of this issue among healthcare professionals, antibiotics are often used in excess. The authors' attempt to describe and draw conclusions regarding this problem were based on observations made in a local hospital.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. In general – yes, but I would like to suggest Authors to check the manuscript again, because, for example, in Material and Methods, point 2.3 there is the same sentence written twice and number 5 from References is not cited in the text. Moreover, I would also like to notice that Authors should not rewrite all of the data from Figures and Tables to the text; Table 2 shows the same data as Figure 5 (please decide if the Table or the Figure should be presented in the manuscript).</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. In my opinion the quality of English should be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Minor revision of the manuscript is recommended.</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:	Damian Chybicki
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Lodz, Poland