

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Pathogen Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_126851
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE IMPACT OF ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE ON CO-INFECTIONS: MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR HIV, TB, AND MALARIA.</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses a crucial and timely issue that holds significant importance for the scientific community, especially given the global rise of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and its impact on public health. By focusing on AMR in the context of co-infections involving HIV, TB, and malaria, it highlights a complex challenge that requires urgent attention and multi-faceted solutions. The manuscript effectively reviews the interconnected factors that exacerbate AMR in these co-infections and provides actionable insights for improving management strategies. I appreciate the comprehensive approach taken to outline current challenges and propose practical strategies, which will be valuable for guiding research and policy development in combating AMR.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title, "The Impact of Antimicrobial Resistance on Co-Infections: Management Strategies for HIV, TB, and Malaria," is suitable as it accurately reflects the manuscript's focus on AMR, co-infections, and specific management strategies for HIV, TB, and malaria. However, a slightly modified title could better emphasize the urgency and significance of addressing AMR in co-infections.  <b>Suggested Alternative Title:</b> "Addressing Antimicrobial Resistance in Co-Infections: Critical Management Strategies for HIV, Tuberculosis, and Malaria"	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract you provided is quite comprehensive, but there are areas where it could be refined for better clarity and precision. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p><b>1. Clarification of Concepts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sentence "AMR occurs when the pathogen-bacteria, virus, fungi, or parasite develops resistance..." could be clearer if the explanation specifically mentions that <b>antimicrobial resistance (AMR)</b> refers to microorganisms treated with antimicrobial drugs. You could modify it as:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "AMR occurs when pathogens—whether bacteria, viruses, fungi, or parasites—develop resistance to the antimicrobial drugs used to treat them, reducing the effectiveness of treatments and resulting in higher morbidity and mortality."</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>2. Co-infection Complexity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You could clarify why co-infection complicates AMR further. For example:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "Co-infection adds complexity by resulting in more intricate diseases, reducing available treatment options, and potentially accelerating the development of resistant pathogens."</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>3. Methodology and Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract does not specify whether the review synthesizes existing literature, is a meta-analysis, or is based on primary studies. Adding a brief mention of the review methodology would enhance the abstract. For instance:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "This review synthesizes evidence from various case studies and literature on AMR in co-infections..."</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>4. Strengthening the Conclusion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion could more strongly emphasize the global importance of addressing AMR in co-infections. You could revise it as:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "This article underscores the urgent need for a global, multi-faceted response to combat AMR, improve infection control measures, and promote the judicious use of antibiotics to delay the emergence of resistant pathogens and safeguard public health."</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript appear to be appropriate and well-organized. The logical flow of the paper is clear, and the subsections are well-defined and relevant to the main topic.</p> <p>However, as mentioned in my previous feedback, incorporating more specific data and references from recent studies would further strengthen the credibility and impact of the review. Additionally, including case studies or real-world examples could make the review more relatable and engaging.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates a strong foundation in scientific knowledge and research. It accurately presents the complex interplay between antimicrobial resistance and co-infections, citing relevant studies and providing clear explanations. The discussion of various factors contributing to AMR, such as pathogen interactions, horizontal gene transfer, and inappropriate antibiotic use, is well-supported by scientific evidence. Additionally, the proposed management strategies align with current best practices and are likely to be effective in mitigating the impact of AMR and co-infections.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references used in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and recent. The list includes a good mix of sources from 2010 to 2024, covering a variety of topics related to antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and co-infections.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally good, and it is suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and well-structured. The use of academic language is appropriate, and the arguments are presented logically.</p> <p>However, there are a few minor issues that could be addressed to further improve the language quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Sentence Structure:</b> Occasionally, sentences can be a bit long and complex. Breaking them down into shorter, more concise sentences can improve readability.</li><li>• <b>Word Choice:</b> Some word choices could be more precise and impactful. For example, using stronger verbs and more specific nouns can enhance the clarity of the writing.</li><li>• <b>Grammar and Punctuation:</b> While the overall grammar and punctuation are correct, a careful review by a native English speaker or a professional editor could help identify and correct any minor errors.</li></ul> <p>Overall, the language quality is adequate for scholarly publication. However, a thorough language edit by a professional editor can significantly improve the clarity and impact of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>While the manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and co-infections, there are a few areas where potential improvements can be made:</p> <p><b>1. Clarity and Conciseness:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some sentences are overly complex and could benefit from simplification.</li><li>• Consider using more concise language and avoiding redundancy.</li></ul> <p><b>2. Reference Formatting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ensure consistent formatting of references throughout the manuscript.</li><li>• Check for accuracy in citation details, such as author names, publication years, and page numbers.</li></ul> <p><b>3. Specific Examples and Data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• While the general overview is strong, incorporating more specific examples and data from recent studies could enhance the impact of the review.</li><li>• This might involve citing specific studies that have quantified the impact of AMR on co-infection outcomes in different regions.</li></ul> <p><b>4. Ethical Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• While the manuscript doesn't directly involve human subjects or animal research, it's important to briefly address the ethical implications of AMR research.</li><li>• This could include discussing the ethical use of antibiotics, the importance of informed consent in clinical trials, and the equitable distribution of antimicrobial drugs.</li></ul> <p><b>5. Future Directions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The conclusion could be strengthened by discussing future research directions, such as the development of novel antimicrobial agents, vaccines, and diagnostic tools.</li><li>• This would highlight the ongoing need for research to address the growing challenge of AMR.</li></ul>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ahmed Elsaid Ali Mostafa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Delta University for Science and Technology, Egypt</b>