

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_95361
Title of the Manuscript:	C-REACTIVE PROTEIN AS AN INDEX OF EARLY DIAGNOSIS OF NEONATAL SEPSIS
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)
Compulsory REVISION 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community.</p> <p>In my opinion, the title is appropriate for the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is complete except that the authors have created too many unnecessary sub-sections in the introduction of the abstract. Yes.</p> <p>Of course the manuscript is scientifically correct. Good abstract, nice introduction, Materials and Methods section is clear, results are well presented and discussed.</p> <p>In my opinion the references are sufficient</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, of course. Even I, who am from a French-speaking country, could read and understand what the authors are talking about in this manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The authors' objective was to determine the usefulness of CRP in the early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis in newborns. It is a quality and innovative work. I believe that having reached their objective, the authors bring relevant information, especially in the discussion part which is clear and precise. In my opinion having nothing to complain about the form and content of this manuscript, it can be published in your journal..	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thiéry Ndong Mba
Department, University & Country	University of Science and Technology of Masuku, Gabon