



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_50799
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of antibiotic resistance crisis: a new horizon in climate change era
Type of the Article	Commentary

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/sdi-general-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The title is too general and it does not fit to the commentary. Two alternatives. (i) The manuscript should be extended to more factors, or (ii) the title should be changed to focus MSR enzymes. Anyway, more information about the two isoforms should be given to give a more informative conclusion. The link between MSR enzymes and global warming should be established.	
Minor REVISION comments	Perspectives contains too many citations to ref. 9. Conclusion is poor: writing "little is still known about MsrB. More detailed studies are needed to understand the exact function of these intriguing proteins and their mechanism of regulation in prokaryotes" is not enough for publishing a commentary with such general title.	
Optional/General comments	The commentary is very appropriate for the current times. The developing of bacterial strains with antibiotic resistance and the increase in the environmental temperature due to the effects of global warming are a serious public health treat. However, the commentary is too short. The commentary is just focused to Methionine sulfoxide reductases as virulence factors for many bacterial strains. Background is Ok, but the perspectives and conclusion are not consistent with the general title and introduction.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	F. Solano
Department, University & Country	University of Murcia, Spain