



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_67499
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY OF THE BACTERIOLOGICAL PROFILE AND THEIR ANTIMICROBIAL SUSCEPTIBILITY PATTERN IN PATIENTS WITH SKIN INFECTIONS.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The authors need to do a major review of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Title of the article has to be looked into. I will suggest as thus: "<b>STUDY OF THE BACTERIOLOGICAL PROFILE AND THEIR ANTIMICROBIAL SUSCEPTIBILITY PATTERN OF BACTERIA ISOLATED FROM INPATIENTS WITH SKIN INFECTIONS</b>" (LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA IF MENTIONED COULD MAKE IT LOOK NOVEL). Otherwise, I see nothing novel in study.</li> <li>The study, however has not shown the bacteriological profile of the bacterial isolates. The few biochemical tests on <i>E.coli</i> is not enough to reveal bacteriological profile of the organism</li> <li>Abstract is quite uninformative, not structured as required in the author's guideline</li> <li>No adequate information was given in the methodology to allow the experiment to be reproduced</li> <li>Figure legends are not appropriately situated. Figure legends should be given below the figures and not above</li> <li>Authors fail to adhere to basic principles of binomial nomenclature.</li> <li>Referencing style is inconsistency. I would suggest that the author's look properly into the author's guideline as provided by the Journal. <a href="https://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/authors-instruction">https://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/authors-instruction</a></li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Olalekan Shadrach Fadare</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Elizade University, Nigeria</i></b>