



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47537
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY OF INTERACTION BETWEEN TIGECYCLINE AND SULBACTAM
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>Interesting theme! Some comments were made in order to contribute to the authors:</p> <p>1 - The Abstract (Summary) <u>doesn't</u> clearly and accurately describe the content of the article. There is no information regarding the type of study. (Check the Journal abstract example): http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/64/authors-instruction. <u>No references should be cited in this part.</u></p> <p>2 - The problem (introduction) is significant and concisely stated. However, I suggest the use of more references, some cited by the author are relevant, but there are more recent references (with other populations), which he could use to add a greater impact to his study.</p> <p>3 - The methods aren't described comprehensively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There isn't information regarding the type of study. - Specify best how the transcription of the report is performed and how the result is released. - What level of significance was adopted in this study to reject the null hypothesis? - What parameters were used in the comparative analysis? - What are the Risks and Limitations for the Study? <p>4 - There are few interpretations and conclusions justified by the results. Discuss the results found with other references. The first paragraph of the Discussion should include the most relevant findings of the study.</p> <p>5 - Explain in detail all tables and figures.</p> <p>6 - Conclusions: A clear and unique conclusion of the authors is needed. In addition, In both Discussion and Conclusion, the authors need to clarify their positions.</p>	<p>It was deleted that is said</p> <p>It was added some references</p> <p>It was added</p> <p>tigecycline, sulbactam tigecycline-sulbactam, are compared among themselves according to descriptors mentioned in the text such as electrophilicity index explaining the electrophilic and nucleophilic behavior of molecules.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Very interesting article for drug interaction but confusing methods and results little discussed.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Studies about drug interaction are important and can contribute to the best knowledge in this Pharmaceutical Research. The manuscript contains new and significant information to justify publication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Interesting study and theme. However, it is necessary to clarify the results and to improve the discussion and to make a brief conclusion.	

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>	