



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>More references are needed to support statements throughout article.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: Line 8: there is conflicting literature on the length of time needed for infection Line 11: don't abbreviate SYBR Green I/PI Line 14: don't abbreviate OSP-A Line 15: change Blot to blot Article: Line 23: However, based upon Centers for Disease Control surveillance criteria, ELISA.... Line 26: Western Line 27: but based upon CDC surveillance criteria... Line 28: Lyme disease Line 29: or in other tissue Line 32: and its reliability has never been standardized for late stage disease Line 32-35: claiming false negative is an inaccurate statement. There is conflicting literature on this subject. If not infection, what would explain the positive reactivity on ELISA? Line 41: both morbidity (chronic illness) and mortality, not just fatalities. Line 46: and other considerations Line 49: "great mass" use another phrase Line 53: and a number of other reasons Line 55: "officially available" incorrect statement. "commonly used" would be more accurate Line 55-56: Although, current technology does not confirm of any better technique incorrect statement. Line 64-68: very controversial statement without sufficient supporting citations. Line 68-69: can't call it standard and also ineffective, better not to use the word standard, instead, commonly used Line 72-74: needs to be worded better Line 83: what is SYBR Green I/PI abbreviated for? Line 93-94: redundant, previously stated Line 102: Osp A rather than ospA Line 109: how do we know they are nonviable? Line 114: chage and to an Line 118: untreated or inadequately treated. Line 118-121: need stronger references Line 122: should be Lyme vaccine in the media</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>It would be good to use a title that more accurately describes the article.</p>	



SDI 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>Robert Bransfield</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, USA</b>