

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76710
Title of the Manuscript:	Coagulase Negative Staphylococci (CONS): A review
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Specify the objective of the article</li><li>2. Insufficient and inappropriate keywords</li><li>3. Regarding the tables, there is a lack of information to understand them.</li><li>4. Disadvantages on the molecular methods</li><li>5. REFERENCES</li><li>6. Bibliographic citations</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. It is necessary to mention from the ABSTRACT what is the importance of the article.</li><li>2. The keywords speciation, Infection are irrelevant since when adding any of these in a search engine the result does not speak specifically about cons, it is recommended to change it.</li><li>3. Specifically table 2 is difficult to understand, you could look for another option</li><li>4. Other disadvantages of using molecular methods should be considered</li><li>5. The bibliographic references should be more current since in the abstract it mentions: "Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS) has gain more importance as pathogenic organism in recent years as causative organism for infections", however the most recent reference is from 2014. <b>The format of the references is varied, APA, Vancouver, etc.</b></li></ol>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Recommendation on writing</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. In general, I recommend reviewing the writing of the manuscript because wrong words are found written, there are plenty of spaces between the reference and the point, add capital letters.</li></ol>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Unnecessary bullets</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The bullets only create space, the information could be added in a linear way</li></ol>	

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Yessica Zapata Vazquez</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Universidad Autonoma De Zacatecas, Mexico</i></b>