

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_96037
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of rotavirus and adenovirus in patients with acute viral gastroenteritis in Dakar, Senegal, 2018-2022
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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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)	1. Yes, the manuscript is very important for scientific community. Overall, this is clear, concise and well written manuscript. The introduction is relevant. Some information about the previous study findings is presented to follow the present study rationale and procedures. It would have been better if the current data regarding morbidity and mortality among under 5 yrs of children in Dakar, Senegal was mentioned. In methodology Inclusion and Exclusion criteria should be clearly mentioned. For result section in Table-3, P value is not mentioned. Overall this is a good manuscript. 2. Yes the title on article is suitable. 3. Abstract is missing the background or Introduction to the study 4. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate but the sentences can be arranged in a better way. 5. Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Yes, but the references are not appropriate to the data provided in some places.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Spelling corrections with grammar correction required.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prasantajyoti Mohanty
Department, University & Country	ICMR, India