

Reviewer comments

Manuscript ID: 80902

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript?

Ans:

Is 'Flare' an appropriate term to describe an increased AMR situation because of AMR neglect or antibiotic use abundantly?

AMR was already described as a “silent pandemic”, that justifies describing the growth by “flare”.

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?

Ans:

The author hasn't explained the study's method, objective, and conclusion (or recommendation). (addressed)

The paper ends with conclusion and recommendation

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript?

Ans:

Yes

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study?

Ans:

The author should add objective and topic coverage in the Introduction section. (addressed)

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail?

Ans:

No

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?

Ans:

It is not clear what the author implies with this statement: **THE IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC: OBSTACLES**. Is the AMR's obstacle an impact on the covid-19 pandemic?

COVID-19 has impacted AMR in 2 ways (negative (resented as obstacles) & positive (presented as opportunities)

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?

Ans:

It is not clear which part of the result section or discussion section.

This review paper, taking into consideration the possibility to vary from the usual original articles format (introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusions), is structured logically with relevant titles towards drawing final conclusion based on presented facts.

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?

Ans:

This query is not relevant to this study.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?

Ans:

This query is not relevant to this study.

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?

Ans:

This query is not relevant to this study.

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references?

Ans:

Yes and No (Not clear answer)

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?

Ans:

The manuscript organization and presentation could be improved (Any suggestions?).

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?

Ans:

The author didn't state it.

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

Ans:

This query is not relevant to this study.