

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_103370
Title of the Manuscript:	"D-Dimer: a primer biomarker in COVID-19"
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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, it can be useful for prognostic and also severity in Covid condition, but the results are not suitable</p> <p>Yes, but unfortunately the results are not suitable</p> <p>Enough, but after read till the end, the abstract need to review because methods, results and discussion are not in line. Please put figure 1 and the paragraphs after figure 1 as discussion, because these are not suitable write in the background. Please sharpen the research gap in background. The last paragraph in background is not suitable pictures the research gap. There are items dots in methods, what are these for? Please integrate the sentences into paragraphs. Statistical analysis only used median? How authors can certain the prognostic, severity of the disease? Also the results do not picture the research question also the title. The discussion need to improve and suitable with title. The conclusion is not suitable with the results, how authors can say that there is correlation, but there was not correlation statistical. Also, the prognostics and the severity of the disease.</p> <p>Scientific may be yes, but overall the methodology need to be major revised. enough</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	enough	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Need to be improved and major revised	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Edward Kurnia Setiawan Limijadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia</b>