

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Pathogen Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPR_123334</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antimicrobial Resistance in Uropathogens Associated with Community Acquired Urinary Tracts Infections in Port Harcourt, Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **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: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study helps to find the local antibiotic resistance patterns and helps in empirical treatment of the urinary tract infections . with appropriate usage of antibiotics we can prevent the antimicrobial resistance. helps in effective antimicrobial stewardship policy	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Methodology was mentioned clearly along with the exclusion criteria and limitation was also mentioned . few places needs spelling corrections and tables alignment . bracket for age can be replaced with age group . check once which are highlighted in red color	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes but all the references font size should be same and few spelling errors once check them	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes few spell checks	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Once go through the article highled in red color Table alignments	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vidyasagar Simhadri
Department, University & Country	Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, India