



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_34541
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiotic Associated Diarrhea with Special Reference to Clostridium difficile
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		
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract section -Line 4 in the results: 18.6 % of patients and not 18.6 % of Patients Introduction section -Line 14 : antibiotic-associated and not Antibiotic-associated -Line 18: ampicillin, amoxicillin, clindamycin and cephalosporins and not Ampicillin, Amoxicillin, Clindamycin and Cephalosporins -Line 26: <i>Salmonella</i> and not salmonella Materials and methods section -Line 55: RCM abbreviation of what Results section -Line 145: Shows predominant and not Shows Predominant -Table 3: <i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> and not <i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> -Line 158: <i>C.difficile</i> was isolated from two (2.9 %) patient add by culture -Line 164: No other anaerobe apart from <i>C.difficile</i> was isolated from the stool samples. What about the 2 anaerobes mentioned in table 2 -Line 175: PCR product and not PCR Product Discussion section -Line 192: In the present study and not In present study -Line 233: <i>C.difficile</i> associated diarrhea (CDAD)	Abstract section - Line 4 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment Introduction section - Line 14 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 18 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 26 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment Materials and methods section - Line 55 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment Results section - Line 145 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Table 3 : Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 158 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 164 : <i>C.difficile</i> mentioned in bracket in



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and not CDAD -Line 248: put dot after in 1.4 % -Line 273: <i>Clostridium difficile</i> was associated AAD in 18.6 % of cases in the present study in the present study. Correct this sentence -Line 274: Toxin was demonstrated in 10 (14.9%) patients and PCR demonstrated presence of organism in additional 3 patients. This means that the total number of positive cases by PCR is 13 and not 9 as in table 4. Check table 4 Line 289 ,292: put dot after et al References section -Line 323: Walk ST and Young VB and not Walk ST, Young VB - Line 336: Boom R, Sol CJ A, Salimans M M M, Jansen CL, Wertheim-van Dillen and J van der N. and not Boom, R., C. J. A. Sol, M. M. M. Salimans, C. L. Jansen, Wertheim-van Dillen and J van der N. -Correct the font of the (,)in references 22 and 24	table 2. <i>C.difficile</i> was the only anaerobe isolated. Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 175 : Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment Discussion section - Line 192 :Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 233 : Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 248 : Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 273 : Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - Line 274 Overall 13 (18.6%) patients gave evidence of <i>C.difficile</i> infection either by culture, PCR or toxin detection (Table 3). <i>C.difficile</i> was isolated from two (2.9 %) patients by culture (Table 4). Additionally, <i>C.difficile</i> could be detected in 7 patients by PCR which were not picked up by culture. Both the culture positive sample showed presence of <i>C.difficile</i> DNA in stool. However, three patients who showed <i>C.difficile</i> DNA in stool sample by PCR did not show presence of <i>C.difficile</i> toxin in the sample. In 10 patients (14.3%) <i>C.difficile</i>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		toxin could be demonstrated in the stool. In 4 of these toxin positive patients no direct evidence of <i>C. difficile</i> infection could be obtained either by culture or PCR. - 2 patients were positive for <i>C.difficile</i> by culture ,toxin and PCR - 4 patients were positive only by toxin - 4 patients were positive by toxin and PCR - 3 patients were positive only by PCR So in 13 patients <i>C.diificile</i> associated diarrhea was seen - Line 289 , 292 : Dot put after et al. References section -Line 323 - Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment Line 336 - Required changes done as per the reviewer's comment - references 22 and 24 – font corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		