



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_30388
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence Of Carbapenem Resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae in Clinical Samples From Some Selected Hospitals in Zaria, Kaduna State.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	This Paper provides a description of the drug resistance profile of 19 strains strains of K.pn isolated in Zaria over a ? year period. The results have not epidemiological value.	The study was carried out between June and November 2015 i.e. over a period of 6 months.
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction 1. Remove references. 2. You have to summarize the introduction part, which is long. 3. the information added to the body of the abstract and paper. Add " The aim of this study was....." Methodology 1. If possible, provide more detail on the geographical sites of collection In line 67 two references [8]. [18] must be grouped [8, 18]. References 30,31, 32 and 33 are placed in the text after 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38 (alphabetical order?). Line 186 The high level of susceptibility demonstrated to Imipenem, Gentamicin and Ciprofloxacin in this study agrees with the study of [34,35,36]. The high susceptibility level (94.7%) to Imipenem recorded in this study is lower than that recorded [37] where they Put the names of the authors and then the references	We agree with your comment and will be corrected. The arrangement of the references is based on chronological order and not alphabetical. All other commented noted and corrected.
Optional/General comments	This work lack originality and robustness	