



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_21476
Title of the Manuscript:	Cryptogenic Invasive Klebsiella Pneumoniae Liver Abscess Syndrome (CIKPLA) – Case Report and Review of Literature
Type of the Article	Case Study

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 31: Abbreviations should be defined as first use eg CF, CT, ... Line 17: a sentence should begin with letter-words, not Arabic numerals. Line 48: figure 1 is not defined/referred to in the text. Line 64: sugar diabetics (persons with diabetis mellitus) is a more appropriate term. Line 94 – 96: aim of the report should be discussed in the introduction. This sentence should be re-written and captured as part of the conclusion to the report. References: consistent referencing with Vancouver style should be engaged. Ref 4,5,7: the month of pub after the year should be maintained throughout or removed. Ref 7, 19: should be checked properly and corrected Suggested reference (for addition): Gordon DM, Feldman C. CIKPLA: Cryptogenic invasive Klebsiella pneumonia liver Abscess (and meningitis) – an emerging disease in South Africa? Southern African Journal of Epidemiology and Infection, 25:2, 28 – 29.	Appropriate changes as suggested have been made to the revised article. Please find the highlighted text in yellow for all the changes in lines 17, 31,64. Line 48: New addition made Line 64: changed Aim was written in the introduction and a re-written in the newly added conclusion section as suggested. References: Month of pub was removed in all references Ref 7 and 19 were corrected New Ref 27 has been added as suggested
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The above corrections should improve the quality of the manuscript.	Thank you very much, highly appreciate all your help