

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 '**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.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)
Compulsory 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	 1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community ,particularly all healthcare givers. It provides an important information about the solution in infection with resistant strains of bacteria. It also provides a detailed information about the kinetics & adverse effects of all tetracycline generations 2. The title of the article is suitable and attractive. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. I think the manuscript is often scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient , recent and UpToDate	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is poor & needs revision. Many spelling, structure of the sentences & grammar mistakes were detected and highlighted in yellow or written in a side comments	
Optional/General 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 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wessam Fahmy El-Hadidy
Department, University & Country	Alexandria University, Medical Research Institute, Egypt