

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_127802
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of antibiotic use during the COVID-19 pandemic. A retrospective cohort study conducted in an Epidemic Treatment Center in Dakar (ETC)
Type of the Article	Original scientific paper

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript dwells into determinants of antibiotic use during a specific COVID-19 pandemic period in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients. The main key-points of the study are that smoking, fever and lung consolidations were the primary reasons for antibiotic use. These findings confirm other similar studies that concern this topic. More studies like this is needed so knowledge acquired can be used to form protocols for adequate antibiotic use in COVID patients	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	There is a need to readjust the titled of this manuscript. The main subject of this manuscript are the reasons for antibiotic use in SARS-CoV_2 positive patients during a specific time in COVID-19 pandemic. It does not concern non- COVID patients and it should be addressed as such. My suggestion: Determinants of antibiotic use in SARS-CoV-2 positive patients (or COVID-19 patients) during the COVID-19 pandemic. A retrospective cohort study conducted in an Epidemic Treatment Center in Dakar (ETC)	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and describes well the meaning of the study as well as the conclusions. Only notice is that it is mentioned that ceftriaxone was the most prescribed antibiotic and in the text says it was azithromycin.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientific sound and correct as well as the statistical analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are up-to-date and sufficient for the range of this manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The general English is sufficient to be understood. There are some grammatical issues like generic names of antibiotics should be written with lower case.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript is interesting and gives a good insight into determinants for antibiotic use in COVID-19 patients. Although it is good as it is, I have suggestions how to possibly improve it: 1. Was remdesivir given to any patients in the study? Or any other antiviral medication? 2.What antibiotics were used besides azithromycin and ceftriaxone? Would be interesting to know as a pattern of local antimicrobial stewardship. 3. Are there any ways of objectification of usefulness (or lack of) of antibiotics (cessation of fever, better respiratory status, decrease in inflammatory markers...) that would justify the use of antibiotics? Was there a way to confirm bacterial superinfection (maybe multiplex PCR from respiratory tract if available in your setting?). Could the patients be divided into two groups (control group that was not given the antibiotic and the observed one that was)? The comparison could give compelling results! 4. Was there an association of antibiotic use and lethal outcome? Was there an association of need for mechanical ventilation and antibiotic use? What about the need of antibiotics after the use of corticosteroids? 5. What day were the antibiotics administrated – at admission or during the hospital stay (community acquired vs hospital acquired)? As I said, these are only suggestions, the manuscript is good as it is.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	Ante Sokota
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	University Hospital for Infectious Diseases "Dr. Fran Mihaljevic" Zagreb, Croatia