



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_47632
Title of the Manuscript:	Target the Bite
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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>)



SDI 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>The author(s) provided interesting review of "Target the Bite". I'm highly impressed by the writing style and good use of English language. However the referencing style, both the in-text and reference list need to be reviewed to reflect a true Vancouver referencing style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The in-text references should not be superscripted, they should be enclosed in parenthesis, eg., [2] and [3,4]. The name of author mentioned in line 75 should be removed and replaced with the list of reference numbers in parenthesis only. The reference list should be reviewed to reflect true Vancouver reference style, eg; <p>1. Wormser, G.P., Bittker, S., Cooper, D., Nowakowski, J., Nadelman, R.B., Pavia, C. Yield of large-volume blood cultures in patients with early Lyme disease. J. Infect. Dis. 2001;184:1070-1072. [PubMed]</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The minor typographic errors in the following lines of the manuscript should be corrected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 28: Furthermore, for those patients who suffer from chronic Lyme, their diagnosis also... Line 53: they actually have the disease or not. Line 69-70: However, in some individuals... Line 77: samples being examined, but this new technique has allowed scientists to be able to count the... Line 90: were those which directly targeted those lingering <i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i> which survived. The ... Line 114: differentiate between an infection which is active or inactive [8]. Therefore, the.. Line 120: antibiotics yet still have persistent arthritis do not have ospA or its respective chromosomal... 	
Optional/General comments	A very interesting review of the subject matter.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Abdu Umar</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Nigeria</i>