

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_100500
Title of the Manuscript:	DENGUE FEVER: ETIOLOGY, DIAGNOSIS, PREVENTION AND TREATMENT
Type of the Article	Review

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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Of course, it might help to get updates on Dengue fever specially in the study area (Nigeria) but still I don't, think it brings new findings. I mean what the author present in this manuscript is that can be found from any books/literatures. ➤ Regarding the title I think it needs modification? It could be written as "what people should know about Dengue fever: the case of Nigeria" ➤ No, it needs revision (i.e., it should be presented in clear order (Background, Objective, Methods used for reviewing, Result and Conclusion) though listing the subheadings is not mandatory. ➤ Yes ➤ I have concerns with respect to the flow of information, otherwise the detailed contents of the paper are scientifically correct. ➤ The references are sufficient but many of them was too old (more than 10 years back). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have no problem with the English quality even though some improvement is needed (grammar use, sentence construction) 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>👍 Overall, I am satisfied with the way the manuscript was presented!</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tadesse Duguma
Department, University & Country	Mizan-Tepi University, Ethiopia