

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_113792
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbapenemase-producing Gram-negative bacilli - an emerging challenge
Type of the Article	A descriptive, retrospective and cross-sectional study.

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes. The manuscript will update available data on the much - researched on MDR Gram-negative bacilli. - It will guide clinicians on the choice of antimicrobials to be used for treatment of the bacterial isolates outlined in this study. - The result of the study will be a pointer to epidemiologists in their fight against drug resistant organisms and proffer control mechanisms to avoid transmission and death of patients. <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article has captured the entire study, with major highlights on the purpose of the study, methods, findings and the significance of results obtained.</p> <p>Yes. The author(s) have used direct logical trends to cover the subsections of the manuscript.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes. The author(s) have done discussions based on the figures and the results obtained from the study. - They have used sufficient statistical analyses to back up their results. - Their conclusion is based on the available data used for the study as is discussed in the manuscript. <p>The references are sufficient and current. Bergy's manual for determinative bacteriology is an added advantage for the characterization of the bacteria.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. The language of the article is well structured for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript follows a logical trend and has treated the rationale of the study.</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:	Nsikan Samuel Udoekong
Department, University & Country	Akwa Ibom State Polytechnic, Nigeria