

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_85381
Title of the Manuscript:	Institutional Analysis of Bacteriological Profile and Antibiotic Susceptibility of Neonatal Sepsis in Eastern Nepal
Type of the 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.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>In the whole article, Please check the spellings or genus and species and capital letter to be mentioned wherever necessary</p> <p>Mention Tazobactum-piperacillin as piperacillin-tazobactum every where.</p> <p>Follow one tense to describe and compare the study.</p> <p>Materials and methods: Please mention the method of detection of resistance(MIC,KB) and guideline followed f)or AST(CLSI,BSAC,EUCAST)</p> <p>How blood culture was processed conventional or automated)</p> <p>were commercial blood culture bottles used and did u monitor by automated blood culture system</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>cefoxitin used to detect MRSA or MRSE or other spp?if detected ,what was %?</p> <p>Cloxacillin also interpret about methicillin resistance in Staphylococci from my point of view,in your study,4 strains of CONS showed resistance to cloxacillin might be methicillin resistant staphylococci.which guideline was followed for AST(CLSI,BSAC OR EUCAST</p> <p>How sensitivity was done by MIC OR KB disc diffusion method?</p> <p>Ampicillin should not be tested against pseudomonas as intrinsically resistant. Few mutant strains of Pseudomonas would be sensitive ampicillin.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Many repetitions of words and sentences,similar composition is seen.</p> <p>The following paragraph can be modified</p> <p>Pseudomonas species(<i>italics</i>) accounted for 14% of total blood culture in this present study which is almost equal (13.4%) to a another study docnduted (spelling) at a tertiary hospital in Nepal[9]. In a study conducted in Peshawar, Pakistan(erase it) Pseudomonas (<i>italics</i>) was isolated in 13% of blood culture-proven sepsis[18][19]</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Modified para:</p> <p>In the present study, Pseudomonas aeruginosa accounted for 14 % of positivity of blood culture ,equivalent to other hospital 4%) and Pakistan based study.(13%.)</p> <p>Try to use conversely, equivalently, corresponding, on the contrary, in contrast to, in the present study, our study, present workup.</p> <p>Try to recompose the discussion part.</p> <p>References style:</p> <p>Please check the reference style.Which guideline did you follow?</p> <p>All reference should be rewritten.</p>	
Minor REVISION 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Grishma Kulkarni
Department, University & Country	MNR Medical College and Hospital, India