

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_99441
Title of the Manuscript:	Study Of Potential Utility Of Predictive Laboratory Parameters For Early Triage Of SARI Patients
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.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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript provides a significant contribution to the scientific research community and I declare that which is good.</p> <p>2. The manuscript is written about Potential Utility Of Predictive Laboratory Parameters For Early Triage Of SARI Patients. Which is suitable for scientific community.</p> <p>3. The abstract is clearly written but need to clear more detailed.</p> <p>4. The manuscript structured is good but need some correction.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references is sufficient but need some corrections</p> <p>This manuscript is describing about SARI Patients but there are several things which might be adjusted.</p> <p>Point 1: Abstract: The abstract didn't contain introduction section. Please add Introduction Section here. Purpose it not clears enough, what the author wanted to do, is not clear meaningful. There is nothing Need to exact indication the p-value? Please add corresponding p-value for each item. Conclusion is not clearly defined and not maintained a scientific way.</p> <p>Point 2: Introduction: Introduction should be more specific and clearly defined. There is nothing about hypothesis. What is the hypothesis in your research? There are many latest publications on the topic. Please follow those.</p> <p>Point 3: Materials and Methods: Sampling technique used but didn't mention any missing information or total numbers of patients they have collected? There is nothing about Cronbach's Alpha for the accuracy of the data.</p> <p>Point 4: Results: What is the significance of your result? Please explain clearly. Graphical Presentation might be good for better visualization.</p> <p>Point 5: Discussion Discussion is not followed by a good way, suggest to follow some good journals. Study ideas are not discussed properly, follow some good papers.</p> <p>Point 6: Conclusion: Conclusion is not associated with abstract, please make the conclusion more suitable for extracting the key points and adding to the abstract content</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some Minor revisions are needed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Citations are not correct 2. Tables and heading should be clearer to understand 3. Alignments and gaps needed to check 4. Graphs should be more organised and visualization 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Selim Mondol
Department, University & Country	Begum Rokeya University, Bangladesh