

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_119981
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of carbapenemases in Pseudomonas aeruginosa isolates: an emerging challenge
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The manuscript is relevant for the scientific community. The manuscript throws light on the emerging challenge of AMR.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title of the article is suitable although little modifications can be done reflecting the work carried out.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Although comprehensive, the abstract needs to refined and concise in terms of language and content.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Introduction should have more content on carbapenamase. Detailed Materials and method is missing. Discussion on AMR should be more comprehensive.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Yes, scientific study is carried out.</b></li> <li>6. <b>References are sufficient and recent. More references pertaining to text in introduction and results can be included.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Additional comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>In many places organism names are not in italics.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Missing information in references.</b></li> <li>3. <b>In text citations brackets are missing in few places.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Can be copy edited for better scientific language	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**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:**

Name:	<b>Sangeetha Menon</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kristu Jayanti College Autonomous, India</b>