

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_103156
Title of the Manuscript:	EPIDEMIOLOGICAL PROFILE OF MENINGITIS IN THE STATE OF PARÁ, AMAZONIA BETWEEN THE YEARS 2018 AND 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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community because the incidence of meningitis is different in different region.</p> <p>I suggest the period of time is stated as during 2018-2022 to prevent the misunderstanding that the authors investigate the incidence in 2018 and 2022 only.</p> <p>The structure of the Abstract usually consist of introduction, method, results and brief discussion.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript should refer to the journal guidance for the authors. There were some section of conclusion that better be presented as discussion, not conclusion. The manuscript is about epidemiological data, scientifically the manuscript is correct but some details are better be presented in the manuscript (such as race distribution in the areas, distribution of the etiology in the areas, how the subject is chosen and the sample number calculation for this descriptive study)</p> <p>The references are recent, but no refeence cited about the incidence outside the Brazil regions. The discussion will be more meaningful for the scientific community if comparative descriptions are included, how the Brazil population is differ than other population in different region.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English quality is sufficient for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	This is an interesting and useful manuscript, some minor revision to clarify and enhance the quality of the study is needed	

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:	Anita Liliana Susanti
Department, University & Country	Jenderal Achmad Yani University, Indonesia