

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76000
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolving definition and diagnostic criteria of Sepsis
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, clarify the link between SIRS criteria (previous sepsis definition) and SOFA score (current sepsis definition), highlighting why organ dysfunction was preferred to inflammatory response (e.g. risk stratification and consequent need of timely interventions). - Recent research demonstrated that only timely appropriate antimicrobial administration and source control may improve patient clinical outcome (Seymour, NEJM 2017). - Please, mention and discuss current SCC guidelines that have been recently published in Intensive Care Medicine and Critical Care Medicine. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, move the comparison between SIRS and qSOFA as well as SOFA and qSOFA sensitivity and specificity in the "Sepsis definitions over the years" section. 	
Optional/General comments	This paper does not provide interesting and new insight into the field of sepsis. Moreover, it is unclear what is the main message that the authors want to deliver to the reader as well as the type of paper that they wrote (editorial? point of view?). Please, specify. Finally, current SSC guidelines introduce some updated recommendation that warrant to be mentioned in this paper in order to make it more interesting.	

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:	Salvatore Lucio Cutuli
Department, University & Country	Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli, Italy