

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80357
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiotic resistance in Clostridium difficile: A rapidly evolving threat
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>BACKGROUND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggest to restructure the sentence "Clostridium difficile infection has varied manifestations in infected people....toxic megacolon" to "Clostridium difficile infection has varied manifestations in infected people, in which it can be asymptomatic but it can also be presented as life threatening condition such as toxic megacolon." - In Table 1, why is the disadvantages of Real Time-PCR left unfilled? - In Table 1, why is the sensitivity and specificity of LAMP test not stated? - Author suggests that "Fluoroquinolones and cephalosporins, in particular, which has been used in the treatment of Clostridium difficile infection has been associated with the evolution of antibiotic resistance in Clostridium difficile", however, <i>C. difficile</i> is intrinsically resistance to fluoroquinolones and cephalosporins, the suggested treatment should be metronidazole and oral vancomycin. Suggest author to restructure the sentence to avoid unnecessary confusion. <p>EPIDEMIOLOGY OF ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE OF CLOSTRIDIUM DIFFICILE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most of the guidelines would actually suggest the use of oral vancomycin and metronidazole as the standard therapy for <i>C. difficile</i> infection, suggest author to highlight and elaborate more on the current practice and choice of antibiotics - For Table 2, can author explain the column "Remarks"? For no.2, Ciprofloxacin, why the remarks is Ciprofloxacin? - In Table 2, why Ciprofloxacin is repeated at no. 2 and no. 8? - In Table 2, what antibiotic does the author means under no. 7 Fluoroquinolones? Fluoroquinolones is a group of antibiotics which actually includes "Ciprofloxacin". Thus, it is better for the author to specify what antibiotics is included here. <p>CONCLUSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In general, as suggested by the topic of the research, author is trying to review recent publications on the resistance trend of <i>C. difficile</i>. However, apart from the resistance pattern, it is more important for the author to highlight on what is the suggested treatments or the proper actions to be taken to prevent the antibiotic resistance - Besides, author should cover more on the local guideline on the treatment of <i>C. difficile</i>. Is the author's national guideline still suggesting cephalosporin as treatment option or the guideline only suggest using metronidazole and vancomycin? If only metronidazole and vancomycin are suggested as the standard therapy, then the review should actually focus more on these medications instead 	
Minor REVISION comments	- Not applicable -	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggest author to use some grammar checking website to improve on the grammar use in the current article - Suggest author to check on minor grammar mistakes throughout the article - Suggest author to italicize "Clostridium difficile" throughout the entire article, some are in <i>Italic</i> form while some are not 	

Review Form 1.6

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lim Ming Chiang.
Department, University & Country	Hospital Sultan Haji Ahmad Shah, Malaysia