



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_29087
Title of the Manuscript:	Integron carriage among carbapenem resistant enterobacteriaceae isolated from a tertiary hospital in North India
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The difference between CNSI and CRE need clarification in the introduction. 2. Reference for the classical method of DNA extraction need to be mentioned 3. The authors have studied the integron carriage only among the resistant isolates. Have you tried to demonstrate whether such carriage is shown by isolates fully sensitive to all the antibiotics?	1. Clarification on CNSI and CRE have been added to the introduction 2. Reference for the DNA isolation method has been mentioned. 3. We only looked at integron carriage rate in carbapenem resistant isolates, we did not demonstrate carriage in fully sensitive isolates, and however your suggestion will be put into consideration in subsequent studies.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Full form of CNSI to be mentioned in the abstract.	The full form of CNSI and MDRE have been mentioned in the abstract
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		