



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_38085
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and susceptibility analysis of carbapenem resistant Gram negative pathogens in super specialty tertiary care center, Mumbai, 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	#40: insert "of" after "is" :delete "but presently" #42: replace "perturbed" with "perturbing" or "disturbing" : delete "the" : replace "including" with "which include" #68: replace "screen" with "seek" #223: Is this a retrospective study because your methodology looks the contrary. Ethical Issue- If samples were collected for this study as indicated in the methodology, there is need for informed consent and ethical approval	Paper revised thoroughly. It is a retrospective study, manuscript revised to avoid the confusions.
Minor REVISION comments	The presentation on table 1 would have been richer if the number of each sample type collected is reflected so you can deduce prevalence for each sample type. It makes more meaning to compare prevalence for each sample type. Table 4 is not necessary. Discussion should be separated from result I feel the manuscript is poorly presented	Done. Removed. Done. Revised.
Optional/General comments		