

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_107648
Title of the Manuscript:	A Nationwide Pharmacoepidemiological Analysis of the Impact of Health Policy on Antimicrobial use in Critical Care Settings in India
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes: The lessons to be drawn from the data and its subsequent analysis have import for antimicrobial stewardship strategies during pandemic and similar emergencies. 2. It is an appropriate representation of the subject matter and what the researchers have done. 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Suggested areas to address</p> <p>GENERAL The author has drawn and stated conclusions while reporting results. It would be more prudent to report the findings only in the result section while reserving the interpretation and similar conclusions or postulations to the discussion section. How was mortality data collected? Was mortality data limited to only patients who died in the hospital? Or was there a followup period post-discharge to determine if patients had died post-discharge? This may be critical to understanding the information provided in line 124</p> <p>GRAMMATICAL</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 38 – “its” should be “their” 2. Line 116 – “cohort overall” should be “overall cohort” <p>REFERENCES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reference(s) needed for line 51 – 54 “Evidence-based guidelines have historically been imperative to ensuring reliable AMS practices, however these peer-reviewed guidelines and policy that evolved over the course of the pandemic were not always easy to follow and/or not always aligned with local messaging.” <p>SUGGESTED REPHRASING TO CLARIFY AMBIGUITY IN MESSAGE –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 264 -266 “Compared with patients in East/Northeast India, the odds of mortality were higher in all other regions” may make the reader wonder why the East/North East was the standard for comparison? Rather “the compared with other regions mortality odds were lower in in East/Northeast India” might convey the message better. 2. Line 351 – 354 the suggested link between the findings and tele-ICU are not clear from the 	

Review Form 1.7

	research. Perhaps the author could provide more evidence in the work. FIGURES Fig 3 – I could not locate the first and second wave as suggested by the key (thick green line)	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Philip Nwajobi-Princewill
Department, University & Country	National Hospital, Nigeria