

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_127251
Title of the Manuscript:	Biochemical analysis of cerebrospinal fluid in a tertiary hospital in South South Nigeria: a one-year perspective.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the biochemical characteristics of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) in a tertiary hospital in South Nigeria. It highlights the trends and diagnostic patterns over a one-year period, with specific attention to pediatric cases of meningitis, sepsis, and febrile convulsions. The study is significant as it underscores the need for proper immunization coverage and better documentation in laboratory practices. The findings have implications for both clinical diagnosis and public health strategies as this studies is very insightful for infection prone countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the scope and focus of the manuscript. Some alternative title are as follows; 1. Biochemical Analysis of Cerebrospinal Fluid in Pediatric Patients: Insights from a Tertiary Hospital Study in Nigeria or, 2. Biological Analysis of Cerebrospinal Fluid in a Tertiary Care hospital, a Retrospective Study 106 Cases in South Nigeria.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study's aim, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, it could benefit from briefly mentioning the limitations of the study to provide a balanced overview.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and follow a logical sequence. The methodology and results are clearly detailed, allowing for reproducibility and better understanding.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It effectively correlates CSF biochemical patterns with clinical diagnoses, such as bacterial meningitis. CSF information is important to evaluate LOC patients. As it is from African region, so CSF data is important for research and comparison. However, the study's limitations, particularly incomplete data from improperly filled request forms, should be discussed more thoroughly to guide future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are relevant and adequate. No additional references are immediately required, though including more recent studies from 2018–2024 could enhance the manuscript's contemporaneity.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor grammatical corrections and improved sentence flow in the discussion section could enhance readability.	

Review Form 3

Optional/General comments	Ethical approval and handling of outliers or missing data are not addressed in the methodology, raising concerns about the study's rigor. Results would benefit from statistical analysis, such as p-values, to support conclusions. The discussion section fails to explore potential reasons for the observed gender disparity and overgeneralizes findings despite a limited sample size and geographic scope. Some references are outdated, and recent literature should be included to enhance the manuscript's relevance.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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:	Abul Kalam Mohammed Shoab
Department, University & Country	Sylhet MAG Osmani Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh