

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78749
Title of the Manuscript:	The Prevalence of Serratia, Stenotrophomonas, Citrobacter and Morganilla Pathogens among Patients with Infectious Diseases at a Governmental Hospital in Riyadh Region
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>My comments :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Materials & methods <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor the suitability and technical standards of the methods. 2. Poor sufficient details of the methods. 3. Process should be provided with principle scientific data so that Another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described. 2. Results <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data not well controlled and robust. 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should be based on actual facts supported with figures. 2. Conclusion not supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript. 3. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them and clarifying it scientifically . 4. All the references cited are not relevant and adequate. 5. My suggestions for Editorial Decision: I suggest the authors must be follow the basic rules of scientific research paper such as aim of scope , study design , materials and methods wrote must clarify (braced with references) , results must supported with pictures and figures accompanied with statistical analysis on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Also must write ethical committee and its number. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Must be Correct all comments	

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

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashraf Mohamed Barakat
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt