

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_98667
Title of the Manuscript:	Fecal Microbiota Transplantation for the Management of Recurrent Clostridium Difficile Infections: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript discusses an extremely relevant and current topic. Fecal microbiota transplantation is a technique evaluated as a treatment for several diseases.</li> <li>2. The title clearly presents the objectives and keywords of the manuscript.</li> <li>3. The abstract briefly presents the relevance of the topic in addition to the methodology, results and discussion of the manuscript. Assessed as appropriate.</li> <li>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</li> <li>5. I believe that the manuscript followed proper scientific methodology in construction.</li> <li>6. Due to the theme being quite recent, the number of references was considered appropriate. The references are extremely recent.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Language quality was considered appropriate. the manuscript is very clear.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is highly recommended to add a paragraph in the discussion/conclusion as there are still few studies on the subject. As well as all conclusions were based on a relatively small n.</li> <li>- it is worth highlighting the main deficient points of the manuscript in the conclusion topic.</li> </ul>	

### PART 2:

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>José Thiago do Carmo Santos</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Health Sciences and Wellness, Faculdade Metropolitanas Unidas, Brazil</b>