



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27298
Title of the Manuscript:	Clostridium Difficile infection in immunocompromised and non-immunocompromised Hosts – a single-center Experience
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	Ethical issues: No, but authors need to confirm that studies were done in compliance of all national and international ethical regulations. The authors have not commented on this.	This is a retrospective study with no clinical intervention. The patient's data handling would follow the local privacy ordinance.
Minor REVISION comments	- Please give some more details about <i>Clostridium difficile</i> in the introduction section, especially latest data on its occurrence in the world and Hong Kong. - The genus and species should be italicised in the paper throughout. - The study was conducted between May 2010 and April 2012. Why it was not published then? Will it now be contemporarily relevant to publish now. If yes, how will it help the scientific community and medical fraternity? - The paper needs to be read by a person whose native language is English. - The authors mention that "the CDI is a disease with remarkable morbidities, complications and mortality whereas the severity is significantly higher in the immunocompromised hosts". How do they substantiate this? (line 272) - The conclusion section is not very clear and	Thank you for your comments - Line 50-55 concludes the most recent local literature available. - Corrected - It took us a longer than expected time to analysed the data and thus the publication was a bit delayed. But over these 2 or 3 years, there is still no study in the region concerning the clinical aspects of CDI. So we believe the study still helps us to understand the clinical conditions of the CDI in Asians. - Amendment done - Please refer to the results in table 3 of the article - Amended - Amended



SDI Review Form 1.6

	needs to be entirely rewritten highlighting the salient findings and future directions for research. The independent clinical predictors for mortality and recurrence may also be further appropriately elaborated while redrafting this section. 7. The authors mention “Further prospective controlled studies are advocated to resolve the controversies in this intestinal disease with rising importance.” What kind of studies are needed? The authors must give directions so that researchers who read this paper may take up the research further.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Redrafting the entire paper would help improve the content and understandability of the paper.	