

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_96923
Title of the Manuscript:	Progress in distinguishing Kawasaki disease from other multi-system inflammatory syndromes by artificial intelligence
Type of the Article	Short communication

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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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>1. The research purpose of this manuscript is to explore the role of artificial intelligence in distinguishing Kawasaki disease from other multi-system inflammatory syndromes, however, the evidence presented in this manuscript is insufficient.</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript is unsuitable.</p> <p>3. Method : Retrieve relevant articles at home and abroad and apply artificial intelligence for comprehensive analysis. This sentence should be replaced by "The relevant literature at home and abroad was searched and the literature results were analyzed comprehensively."</p> <p>4. The innovation of this manuscript is not enough to be published as a "Short communication", but it is more suitable to be regarded as an overview.</p> <p>5. The subsections and structure of the "Content" article are too confusing and should be discussed at different levels.</p> <p>6. Some up-to-date references, such as doi: 10.1542/hpeds.2022-006868. doi: 10.1155/2022/8739498, should be mentioned in the introduction.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhifang Zhang
Department, University & Country	China