

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_97596
Title of the Manuscript:	Circulation of rotavirus genotypes and their distribution among vaccinated and non-vaccinated children in Abuja, Nigeria
Type of the Article	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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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 REVISION</b> comments 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Already this research work as reported was more than ten years old, so these research findings were of no such huge impact and supposed to be of Obsolete 2. Research title is confusing as no one should conduct any research study on any particular locality and emphasized that this is our findings as far as such confined locality is concerned and claimed it to be of a novel work. Strongly object this type of work 3. Abstract is confusing and giving wrong data....which is not matching methodology and result as described later in the manuscript as far as sample size is concerned. 4. Yes 5. No 6. No	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is Poor	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prasana Kumar Rath
Department, University & Country	OUAT, India