

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_109203
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiotics prescribing practices in a Paediatric Outpatient Clinic in Owerri, Imo state; How rational?
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript addresses the antibiotic prescribing practices in a paediatric outpatient clinic, a subject matter of considerable significance. However, I have several critical observations for the authors to consider:</p> <p>(a) Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first sentence is incomplete and conveys a sense of inquiry rather than a clear statement. - An explanation of the term "a descriptive prospective study" is needed. - The methodology section necessitates additional detail, encompassing study design, inclusion and exclusion criteria, study instruments, and data analysis procedures. - The results are somewhat obscure. Clarification is required for phrases such as "in keeping with the optimal range of 1.6-1.8 per encounter," "within the prescribing indicator optimal value of 10%," and "79.2% of antibiotics were prescribed as generics, which was below the optimal value of 100%." - The conclusion lacks a clear connection to the study's objectives. <p>(b) Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The background and rationale for the study require greater clarity. The authors' citations of WHO information and related literature are not effectively linked to the study. - The study objective needs to be more specific, as the terms "assess" and "practice" are overly general. <p>(c) Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is "CHOP" a standard abbreviation? - Essential information about the study instrument and data collection methods is absent. <p>(d) Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results do not clearly demonstrate how they relate to the "rationality" of antibiotic prescribing. <p>(e) Discussion and Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Due to the lack of clarity in the study objectives and endpoints, the discussion and conclusion appear disjointed and incongruous. - <p>In summary, substantial revisions are essential before this study can be considered for publication.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Additionally, a thorough language editing process is required to address the grammatical errors present throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Huan-Keat Chan
Department, University & Country	Malaysia