

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJRM_121687</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Tigecycline resistance, a clinical challenge: Experience from a tertiary care center of North India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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 is quite relevant considering that it provides important information on resistant patterns of two last line drugs. Tygecycline antibiotic being a reserve last line antibiotic, it is very important to monitor its performance in terms of susceptibility patterns. Hence the findings of this study will guide policy on how drugs on reserve can be used to minimize over-use or misuse that may lead to AMR.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title of the manuscript is fine (Short and clearly). However he/she may decide either to include a few words like "Tygecycline resistant pattern among carbapenem resistant gram negative bacilli: Prospective cross-sectional study"	
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.	The abstract is fine. Though I would suggest that the author makes it clear that Tygecycline is a glycylyccline class, derived from tetracycline	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes they are appropriate It's important that the author indicate -Exclusion criteria on methodology -Limitation of the study after discussion, conclusion	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound: There is good flow of concepts from introduction, methods, results and discussion. Excellent literature reviewing and citing with relevant references.. The findings compliment objectives, and are quite relevant in antimicrobial stewardship programmes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<b>YES;</b> It has less grammatical errors, besides simple phrases/sentences that are easy to understand for non-technical personnel	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Brany Titus Mithi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malawi</b>