

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_97594
Title of the Manuscript:	BURDEN OF ROTAVIRUS DIARRHOEA IN CHILDREN IN ABUJA
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:

(<https://www.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe that this manuscript is important for scientists and doctors. This manuscript contains up-to-date information on the age and seasonal characteristics of rotavirus infection in children, the authors showed the problems of disease surveillance in Nigeria, the results also indicate the effectiveness of the introduction of vaccination. 2. The title of the article suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. In my opinion, the authors of the manuscript used too many outdated references sufficient and recent - 50% from 1987-1998. This fact reduces the relevance of the work. It is necessary to add references sufficient and recent of the last 10 years. <p>In the conclusions, the authors note that the manuscript indicates the feasibility of introducing vaccination against rotavirus. However, the discussion of the results did not emphasize that there is a difference between the incidence of rotavirus infection in vaccinated and unvaccinated children. This conclusion is important, so I believe that these data should be added to the discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is relevant and up-to-date, but it needs to be supplemented with scientific articles of recent years and the reviewer's remarks should be taken into account.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Usachova Olena
Department, University & Country	Zaporizhzhia State Medical University, Ukraine