

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_92600
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Risk Factors for Mucormycosis in Covid-19 Patients Admitted in Tertiary Care Hospital Aurangabad.
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Place the type of study carried out in the summary, you should never omit that the reader knows everything</li> <li>- it is good that you put that it is a cross sectional study, however remember that you must put that it is also retrospective, qualitative, because you mention that it is only descriptive, you need to mention the variables that you took into account</li> <li>- you have to put inclusion, exclusion and elimination criteria (consider that these last two are not the same)</li> <li>- your sample is good, however you mention in the inclusion criteria that either the tomography or the histopathological study was taken into account, you cannot compare the sample, you would fall into bias, the diagnosis must always be with HISTOPATHOLOGY, the imaging study ( radiology, magnetic resonance or tomography or other) are only diagnostic aids, they do not give you the definitive diagnosis. Therefore your design is wrong.</li> <li>- only 5 variables? Do you really think that's enough? it is a descriptive study, 5 variables say nothing and are not useful, please consider modifying and improving the study. There is a lot of literature on cases of mucormycosis and case series or epidemiological studies that have a better design, please consider it and reconsider it because your study is too poor</li> <li>- the treatment section is too ambiguous, put antibiotic, steroid, it tells us nothing, descriptive studies do that, describe, give all possible information, yours does not provide new information, it is not complete, it is too poor, it does not describe anything again, it does not help the guild to really value the characteristics that you mention so much as an objective, you are not even fulfilling what the title gave</li> <li>- you need to improve the methodology section, approach someone who is an expert in the area, or rely on a statistician to teach you how to interpret the results</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- you need support for english</li> <li>- you need good writing, there are many misspellings</li> <li>- With respect to what you mention in limitations, what you actually put is not limiting, your sample is good, it is not too large but it is considered important, it is not common to find so many cases of mucormycosis, the studies reported and published in various journals are few cases, perhaps the way in which you selected the sample and what you mention that in some you consider diagnosis based on image and others on histopathology perhaps it really underestimated whether they are cases of mucormycosis or not, you leave many gaps many doubts, it is not clear to you study, must be improved</li> <li>- did you just get percentages?</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	the tables must be referred to in the text, they only serve to exemplify, it does not mean that it is your entire result, you must describe and explain them textually in the results section and put in parentheses which table you are referring to and each table must have a footnote image	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alejandra Giselle Juárez Rebollar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Colegio de Odontologos del Valle de Mexico, Mexico</b>