

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRID_101201</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pattern of Liver Function Test in Scrub Typhus Cases: A Hospital Based Observational Study in A Tertiary Care Center in Nepal</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>		
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Title: Review and Suggestions for Improvement of "Pattern of Liver Function Test in Scrub Typhus Cases: A Hospital Based Observational Study in A Tertiary Care Center in Nepal"</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>The abstract provides a clear background and aim of the study. The methodology is briefly described, including the study location, duration, and number of participants. The main findings and conclusion are summarized concisely. The authors should specify the specific aims of the study in more detail, such as the specific liver function tests investigated and the clinical risk characteristics analyzed and include the key findings or main results of the study in the abstract to provide a better overview of the research.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>It provides a comprehensive overview of scrub typhus and its significance as a cause of febrile illness in children in rural tropics and mentions the prevalence of hepatic dysfunction and deranged liver function tests in scrub typhus cases. It discusses the need for further understanding of the clinical implications and risk factors associated with hepatic dysfunction in scrub typhus, while it provides a brief background on the prevalence of scrub typhus in Nepal and previous studies conducted in the country. The authors should better organize the introduction to improve readability, provide more recent references to support the information presented, specify the gaps in knowledge that the present study aims to address and clearly state the research objectives or research questions.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p><b>Methods:</b></p> <p>The section describes the study design as a prospective hospital-based observational study conducted at a specific teaching hospital in Nepal and mentions the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participant selection. Also, it provides details on the diagnostic criteria and tests used to confirm scrub typhus infection and rule out other infectious conditions, while it specifies the liver function tests performed and the laboratory equipment used. The authors should provide more information on the sample size calculation or justification for the sample size used in the study and include details on the specific diagnostic criteria used for scrub typhus and the diagnostic tests performed. It would also be interesting to provide more information on the standard guidelines followed for conducting liver function tests and mention how the data was collected and any statistical methods used for data analysis.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b></p> <p>The paper presents the demographic characteristics of the study participants and it provides a table summarizing the clinical manifestations, laboratory parameters, and complications of scrub typhus, while it compares the study findings with previous studies conducted in different regions. The authors should include more details on the statistical analysis performed and any significant findings and should provide more information on the severity of hepatic dysfunction and deranged liver function tests observed in the study participants. Also, it would be great to discuss the clinical implications and potential prognostic value of the observed liver function abnormalities and to discuss the limitations of the study and potential biases that may have affected the results. Overall, the paper provides valuable insights into the pattern of liver function test abnormalities in scrub typhus cases. However, improvements can be made by providing more specific research objectives, including additional details in the methodology section, and expanding the discussion to include the clinical implications and limitations of the study. Additionally, the introduction could benefit from more recent references to support the presented information.</p>	
--	--	--

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jonathan Soldera</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of South Wales, United Kingdom</b>