



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57460

Title: Bacteriological and Clinical profile of Community Acquired Pneumonia in hospitalized patients at a tertiary care centre in Telangana.

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			✓	
Techn. Quality				✓
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Recommendation

Borderline rejection if not substantially improved

The manuscript addresses an important clinical topic—bacteriological profile and antibiotic susceptibility in community-acquired pneumonia (CAP). While the topic is relevant, the study in its current form has significant methodological, conceptual, and presentation limitations. The findings are not sufficiently robust or novel, and major revision is required.

Major Comments

1. Study Design and Definition Issues

Although the study is labeled as CAP, inclusion of endotracheal secretions and BAL samples raises concern for hospital-acquired or ventilator-associated pneumonia. This creates a major misclassification bias and undermines the validity of conclusions.

2. Short Study Duration and Limited Scope

The study was conducted over only 3 months, which is insufficient to capture seasonal variation in CAP pathogens. This limits generalizability.

3. Microbiological Methodology Limitations

Only conventional culture methods were used. Important CAP pathogens (e.g., atypicals, viruses) are completely missed, making the “bacteriological profile” incomplete.

4. Overinterpretation of Results

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The conclusion that *Klebsiella pneumoniae* is an established CAP pathogen is overstated and may reflect sampling bias or hospital flora contamination, especially given the specimen types.

5. Antibiotic Recommendations Not Justified

Suggesting carbapenems for empirical therapy is inappropriate based on this dataset and contradicts standard CAP guidelines. This is a serious concern regarding clinical applicability.

6. Lack of Statistical Analysis

The study is purely descriptive. No statistical comparisons, confidence intervals, or significance testing are provided.

Minor Comments

1. Multiple grammatical and formatting errors (e.g., "processedby," spacing issues).
2. Title is long and can be simplified.
3. Abstract structure is inconsistent and lacks clarity.
4. No clear inclusion/exclusion criteria described.
5. Sample type percentages (line 31–32) are unclear and poorly presented.
6. Keywords should follow standard indexing terms.
7. References are not fully shown here