

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_95019
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN SIRS, QSOFA, NEWS ANSD MEWS SCORE AS PREDICTORS FOR INHOSPITAL MORTALITY OF PATIENTS GETTING ADMITTED TO ICU OF A TERTIARY CARE TEACHING HOSPITAL
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>A strong and cohesive paper aimed on comparing different prediction scores, emphasizing sepsis. Following Sepsis-3 definition and its related drawbacks, including late diagnosis of sepsis, selection of proper predictive system becomes even more important</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>Yes, the abstract needs no correction Clear and fully appropriate</p> <p>Both scientific approach and methodology are fine. Results are correct and depict the really existing scientific facts. The number and selection of references are OK.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language and overall formatting are good.	
Optional/General comments	As for future studies by this group (not directly related to this paper), I'd like to recommend using of additional scoring systems and wider selection of end-points, incl. major and minor complications	

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:	Ruslan Sydorчук
Department, University & Country	Bukovinian State Medical University, Ukraine