

ReviewForm1.6

JournalName:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JPRI_88536
TitleoftheManuscript:	Therapy of Enterobacteriaceae Infections using their specific Bacteriophages
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.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	The article is good but needs a few modifications which is installed in the pdf file	The modifications have been carried out All corrections are highlighted in yellow
Minor REVISION comments The title Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The title to be changed to A review on <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i> therapy using Bacteriophages- This not abstract, where are the results of the study and the method of the work or evidence of it?	New title looks more viable hence we have considered it good and has been changed The paper is not a research journal, it is a review article
Optional/General comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Keywords- Introduction- 2. Phage Therapy History- Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Keyword should be <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>, Bacteriophage, Therapy.- Its not clear whether the phage was used in the treatment or not- Septicemia- Shigellosis- <i>The</i> discussion- [11][12] was changed. Although the paper with similar mistakes- Year to be added to <i>et al.</i> when references were made- Phage therapy has been found also to work on <i>Enterobacteriaceae</i> based on attained researches [27-29].- Conclusion- About taking the whole section from one source in [4]	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- This has been done- <i>using phage therapy</i> have been added- septicemia- shigellosis- <i>The</i> discussion ('the' was added)- Changed to [11,12]. Same corrections has been made all over the paper- Corrected- Corrected- Conclusion has been restructured- Some section of less relevance to the paper have been clipped out making it adjusted enough to fit in as one source

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>	