

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_96507
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON HUMAN METAPNEUMOVIRUS AND HUMAN BOCAVIRUS ASSOCIATED WITH ACUTE RESPIRATORY TRACT INFECTIONS
Type of the Article	Review 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes it is important as the manuscript is about the epidemiology, diagnosis and management of 2 important viruses of Respiratory tract infections. 2. Yes suitable 3. Abstract can be made more comprehensive to add 1-2 more important lines regarding (hMPV) and HBoV). this sentence is not too important to be added in Abstract Human metapneumovirus (hMPV) and human bocavirus (HBoV) infections are uncommon, especially among rural children 4. Yes subsections and structure of manuscript is appropriate 5. Yes 6. Many References are older than 5 years and even older than 10 years. there should be more recent references in their place. At least 10 years old references must be replaced with recent references. Reference no.5,6,8,9,11,13,15,17,19,20 ,27 to 36,39,44,45,50,51,53,60 to 69,77,79 to 90,95 to 100,102 are older	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes Language and quality of English is suitable for scholarly communication	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mirza Muhammad Ahsan Baig
Department, University & Country	Civil Hospital Daska, Pakistan