

Review of: "Inhibiting Efflux Pumps and Resistance Mechanisms: A Mini Review"

Ana Margarida Borges¹

¹ Instituto Politécnico de Bragança

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review:

Overall: The article is simple but very well organized - It is a mini-review. However, the language it's not scientific, it has many expressions with slang language. And it should have more information, it feels incomplete. For this reason, I don't recommend the publication of this article.

1. **Title:** It's short, good and it goes according to your investigation.
2. **English grammar, sentence structure, and article design:** The article is written in simple english, and all of the connections are logical. However, it has many expressions with slang language. It's not appropriate for a scientific review.
3. **Abstract:** Strong abstract. Everything is connected, there is all the information needed, and the english is good. I have nothing noteworthy to say about this.
4. **Review:** Solid information, It's simple, a mini-review, but it feels incomplete – We need more about the theme. Furthermore, it's well organized with several titles and subtitles according to the information given. However, and this is a major point, there is many expressions with slang language – for example: Page 2: "Maybe not flavors, but you get the point" or "Not today, antibiotics!"; Page 3: "It's like giving the bouncer a pair of handcuffs, making it impossible for them to kick anyone out."
5. **Conclusion:** Good conclusion, it contains all the information required. The best part of the article. The only thing that I have to point out it is a bit brief, you should develop the topic more.
6. **References:** You should review this part, you use old references (more than 10 years old) - Example: *Bauer, R. A., & Wortzel, L. H.. Doctor's choice: The physician and his sources of information about drugs. Journal of Marketing Research, 1996, 3(1), 40-47.*