

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_103230
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical and bacteriological relevance of procalcitonin: a single center, retrospective observational study.
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.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, manuscript is important 2. Title needs no changes 3. Abstracts should have clear written aim in statistical language, type of study. Conclusion needs reframing. 4. Lots of grammar mistakes and need to recheck throughout manuscript 5. I could not get an idea why paediatric patients were excluded 6. In results, PCT values are mean values for that variant? If yes than should have SD values 7. Do not use abbreviations 8. Table one should have values for each variable 9. Page 8 para on 28-day mortality what author wants to say is difficult to understand 10. Also, purpose of table 2 is difficult to understand 11. Again, in discussion aim written is very vague. Discussion should happen as per aim in proper heads. 12. Lots of repetition in discussion and so discussion should be re written. 13. I would suggest to add comparative table for author's aim 14. Again, conclusion should be as per aim. 15. Please add latest published literature in your references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Lots of grammar mistakes	
Optional/General 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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kinnari Vala
Department, University & Country	Gujarat University of Transplantation Sciences, India