

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_122367
Title of the Manuscript:	Pseudomonas species and Acinetobacter baumannii associated Urinary tract infection: Antimicrobial resistance patterns and therapeutic alternatives.
Type of the Article	Original 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 selection of the study on two important organisms and the most common infection is appreciated. But this is done with two to three years past data. And also, retrospective study plan is selected. The benefits of the study is to be under discussion	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As per research article publication guidelines, the title of the study can be modified including the type of study, study design and study population.	
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 its comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes appropriate	
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 article gives a retrospective analysis of UTI and its two important organisms. The type of sample collected – whether its midstream urine or catheter sample or which type if included increase its significance. The suggestion of empirical treatment for such infections is not appropriate. Once the laboratorial diagnosis is confirmed the antibiotics should be given Otherwise the empirical treatment should be non specific.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	No, the reference within past 5 years of the study to be included.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The tabular columns can be revised with better understanding. Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sowmya.N
Department, University & Country	Sri Muthukumaran Medical College Hospital & Research Institute, India