

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_127608
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF PRUDENT ANTIBIOTIC USAGE CAMPAIGNS: ENHANCING HEALTHCARE QUALITY AND REDUCING COSTS
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	This manuscript addresses the misuse of antibiotics (a crucial global health issue). It has provided valuable insights into effective strategies for improving antibiotic stewardship. This study is a piece of evidence supporting the implementation of evidence-based interventions to optimize antibiotic use and safeguard public health	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The comprehensiveness and impact of the manuscript can further be enhanced from the scientific community's point of view by <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Including the intervention's components (e.g., educational sessions, and guideline implementation) can strengthen the understanding of the study's methodology. 2. Including the Key findings from the cost analysis, such as the percentage reduction in antibiotic costs or the specific cost-saving measures implemented, can further emphasize the study's practical implications. 3. Include the study's limitations, such as the relatively small sample size or the potential for selection bias, which can add credibility to the research. 4. Including future research directions, like conducting a larger, multicenter study or exploring the long-term impact of the intervention, can stimulate further investigation in this area. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Here are a few areas(subsections) that could be improved <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: Focus on the core problem of antibiotic resistance and the study's specific context (RSND Semarang). State the research gap that the study aims to fill. 2. Methods: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study participants. b. Explain how the cost analysis was conducted, including the specific costs considered. c. Discuss the limitations of the study design, such as the potential for bias due to the quasi-experimental nature. 3. Results <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Highlight the most important findings (statistics of the study and discuss their implications. b. Using statistical tests to compare the pre-and post-intervention periods 4. Discussion <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Relate the findings to existing literature and highlight the unique contributions of the study. b. Discuss the potential limitations and future directions for research. 	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript addressed the pressing issue of antibiotic resistance, its stewardship, assessed the antibiotic prescribing quality, and provided valuable insights into one of the effective strategies for improving antibiotic prescribing practices. The small sample size affects the reliability of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Try to include the World Health Organization (WHO), IDSA Guidelines as a reference can provide evidence-based recommendations to support your findings.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid complex sentence structures 2. Strive for clarity and conciseness throughout the manuscript. 3. Some sentences, particularly in the introduction, could be simplified to improve readability. Consider breaking down complex sentences into shorter, more concise ones. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Try to give more detail in the methodology part.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mobeen Shaik</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>KL College of Pharmacy, KLEF, India</p>