

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_100694
Title of the Manuscript:	Emergence of third generation tetracyclines: New magic bullets to tackle antibiotic resistance in the post-antibiotic era
Type of the Article	Review 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 '**l a c k o f N o v e l t y**', 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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/editorial-policy> )

### **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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	1. The topic of this study is very interesting and useful for the clinical practice in infectious diseases.  2. The title of the article is fine.  3. The abstract should be amended as followed: 3.1 Please delete the first sentence. 3.2 Please add more data of tetracycline resistance rate and severity to the first part of the abstract, and highlight the importance of development of new/third-generation tetracyclines. 3.3 It is still unclear about the difference between the third-gen tetracyclines and the previous ones. Please re-write the sentences for better understanding. Also, the difference should include pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and spectrum of the drugs.  4. The structure of this manuscript is fine. Only the third-generation tetracyclines should be separated to another section (section 3, and move the conclusion to section 4) because this article focuses on the third-generation tetracyclines, so they should be given more attention.  5. No scientific mistake is detected in this manuscript.  6. The references used in this manuscript are up-to-date and proper.	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Almost all English language in this manuscript is correct and understandable. There are, however, some spelling mistakes in the manuscript, such as "fro", "cystitis", "pneumoniae", "medica use", etc. Please do proof-reading before publication.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	It may be worth if the authors add some more clinical data regarding the efficacy of the third generation tetracycline agents. For example, after the dosage and adverse effects are described, the authors can mention some clinical studies showing that the drug is effective in clinical practice.	

### **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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**  
**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Suriyon Uitrakul
Department, University & Country	Walailak University, Thailand