

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_126260
Title of the Manuscript:	Blood Culture Positivity and Pathogen Susceptibility in Bloodstream Infections: A Comprehensive analysis of Microbial Trends and Antimicrobial Resistance
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is highly valuable for the scientific community as it addresses critical trends in pathogen prevalence and resistance patterns in bloodstream infections (BSIs). Understanding these microbial trends is essential for optimizing treatment protocols, improving patient outcomes, and informing public health interventions. Additionally, the manuscript's focus on antimicrobial resistance is timely, as resistance rates continue to rise, threatening the efficacy of standard treatments.	Yes
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable	Yes
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive	Yes
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	Yes
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it likely employs standardized blood culture techniques and susceptibility testing methods to accurately profile bloodstream infection pathogens. Its strength lies in the comprehensive analysis of a large sample set, allowing for statistically significant insights into pathogen prevalence and resistance trends.	Yes
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent	Yes
Minor REVISION comments	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	Yes
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	NA