

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_97276
Title of the Manuscript:	Duration of antibiotics in Community acquired pneumonia, Physicians fancy?
Type of the Article	Short communication

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1.This is a short communication on the prolonged use of antibiotics in the treatment of patients with community acquired pneumonia. Based on 2019 ATS recommendations guideline, the authors analysed the prescriptions of 37 patients diagnosed with pneumonia admitted to the hospital. In the discussion, they bring up the question of why the treatment is prolonged unnecessarily, as observed in 25 of the 37 patients analyzed. This is an important question. However, the study is observational, with a limited number of patients, carried out in a single center, and cannot conclude that this result can be reproduced in other centers.  2.Yes  3. The purpose of the study is unclear  4.Yes  5.Yes  6.Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Claudia Henrique da Costa
Department, University & Country	State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil