



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3476
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: A NOVEL PERSPECTIVE
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript is very important for the scientific community; it tries to investigate antibiotic resistance using AI, which is the new approach for the health sectors. But it needs more detailed and explained ways of elaboration, how AI help to predict antibiotic resistance pattern.</p> <p>Yes it is suitable</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive abstract.</p> <p>It needs modification, the result and discussion should be clearly discussed. There is no adequate explanation for the results and discussion to make the article plausible.</p> <p>Yes, but need minor revision in the method section</p> <p>There are sufficient references</p>	



<u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The conclusion should be short and precise, and there are too many heading and sub-headings please try to merge some of them	
<u>Optional</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hailehizeb Cheru Tegegne
Department, University & Country	Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia