

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79054
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction in Culture-Negative Cerebrospinal Fluid Samples of Bacterial meningitis Patients
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	It is a good research work. Although the sample is relatively small, the results are interesting and for a population where these types of problems abound, such as India or Latin America, these findings are important because they help us to make medicine faster and more effective.	Limitation of time and fund during the study hinder to carry out the experiment in large scale and sometime non availability of sample is also another reason for relatively small sample size.
Minor REVISION comments	How do you explain the significant difference between the male and female population? Is it biological or is it cultural? What is the cost of the study panel for these three tests for a patient with suspected acute bacterial meningitis?	1. The significant gender difference is both biological and cultural. From biological point of view during the study period male predominance was observed and also in cultural point of view the occurrence of bacterial meningitis is more than female. 2. In total the cost of study panel for the three test was Rs 3500, but the tests were free of cost during the study period as it was funded by ICMR, New Delhi which was duly acknowledged.
Optional/General comments	I think it is an interesting and well-supported work.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No, proper ethical approval was taken to carry out the study and consent was taken from either parent or guardian of the patient.