

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81343
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SHORT-COURSE VS LONG COURSE ANTIBIOTIC THERAPY AMONG PATIENTS WITH COMPLICATED INTRA-ABDOMINAL INFECTIONS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>The study is very interesting. The methods are well structured. The discussion provides a good background to the literature- However several point should be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the abstract section. The acronym TLC should be described. The terminology should be better edited. "ultrasound abdomen pointing towards infective foci" can be replaced by "ultrasound abdomen examination consistent with infective foci". "lottery method " can be replaced with random assignments. -In the abstract section, differences between groups should be substantiated with statistical data. -The keywords should not be too long groups of words. For example Early resolution of complicated intra-abdominal infection is not a key word. -In figure 1 the y-axis should be better described with a caption. A value that could be put on the y-axis for a better understanding could be the percentage of patients with resolution of the infection. -In the methodology it should be indicated by which statistical method the 2 groups were compared (chi square?). The statistical accuracy should be indicated with its p value. -The acronym SIRS should be explained in the discussion section. -In the discussion it should be noted what this paper adds to the existing literature. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In table 1 describing data with standard deviation can increase the scientific value of the paper. 	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giuseppe De Carli
Department, University & Country	Università di Siena - Palazzo del Rettorato, Italy