

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Pharmacology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12938

Title: Carbapenemases: a worldwide threat to antimicrobial therapy

Reviewer code: 00506567

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-29 18:32

Date reviewed: 2014-08-08 19:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In my opinion the manuscript is not suitable for publication and requires major revision. I also recommend the authors to read carefully the "Instruction to author" section. Major points: - English needs revision - The name of microorganisms should be written in italics. - Reference section: many of them are "out of date" and others are cited four times (107, 134, 154 & 158) - Table 3: Is it needed a table to show the clinican breakpoints for Enterobacteriaceae? - Table 2: OXA-24 and OXA-40 are the same enzyme - Table 2: OXA-40 has also been identified in two *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolates.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Pharmacology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12938

Title: Carbapenemases: a worldwide threat to antimicrobial therapy

Reviewer code: 00506543

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-29 18:32

Date reviewed: 2014-09-05 20:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A good review I suggest to add CLSI break point to table 3 and to compare that to EULCAST and elaborate on any differences.