

Review Form2

Book Name:	Research Perspectives of Microbiology and Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2284
Title of the Manuscript:	Long Term Characteristics of Clinical Distribution and Resistance Trends of Carbapenem-Resistant and Extended-Spectrum β-Lactamase Klebsiella pneumoniae Infections: 2014–2022
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	INTRODUCTION 1. The introduction is well written. However, the article itself needs to be proof read by a native English speaker as there are some grammatical errors - such as (In Europe, carbapenem resistance rates in<i>E. coli</i> and KP and vancomycin resistance rates in <i>E. faecium</i> have increased significantly between 2014 and 2020.) MATERIALS AND METHODS The material and methods is well written. RESULTS 1. ascites (1.1%, 48/4547) not showing figure 2A 2. error of nephrol- ogy, word 3. this sentence amtreonam (which types of antibiotic kindly correct antibiotic name) In addition, KP detected in the third quarter was more susceptible to resistance to cephalosporins and amtreonam 4. some sentence cipro- floxacin and ciprofloxacin used correct this error DISCUSSION The discussion is well written. CONCLUSION The conclusion is well written.	

Review Form2

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part .		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Rahul Kumar Banerjee
Department, University & Country	Balco Medical Centrer, India