

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</a>
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.	Yes, The current research is valuable regarding to Bloodstream infections	Yes
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It's better to revise scientifically. Microbial Trends and their drug Resistance responsible for Bloodstream Infections; A Comprehensive analysis in (.....where study performed??)	Corrections done.
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive but need revision. Please separate different section, for instance: objective, material & method, results, conclusion.	Corrections done.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but some section need to improve.	Revised.
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.	Using standard lab procedure	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it's good but need revise as a native in some sections.	Revised
Optional/General comments	Please insert number page and line number. Please improve your introduction. It's very summery. Please mention highlight and limitation of your study Please adjust abstract to 250 word count. Please provide suitable keywords from MESH?	Page and line numbers inserted. Revised Done Abstract edited to 250 word count Done

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