

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_118183
Title of the Manuscript:	Renal and hemorrhagic complications following bee sting envenomation: a case report from the hospital of Zinder
Type of the Article	Case report

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>The manuscript discusses the significant medical ramifications of bee stings, which are widespread worldwide. Comprehending the renal and hemorrhagic consequences linked to bee stings is essential for healthcare professionals specializing in emergency medicine and toxicology. The comprehensive examination of systemic consequences, such as rhabdomyolysis and acute renal failure, emphasizes the necessity for immediate and suitable medical care.</p> <p>The title explicitly highlights the emphasis on renal and hemorrhagic consequences, which are distinct and important features of bee sting envenomation. This facilitates the attraction of the appropriate audience who are specifically interested in these particular complexities.</p> <p>The abstract provided for the article is fairly comprehensive, covering the key elements of the case. However, a few additions and refinements could make it more informative and cohesive.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For example: Expand on why this rarity is significant. For example: "Renal and hemorrhagic complications following envenomation by bee stings are rare, presenting significant challenges for diagnosis and treatment in clinical settings." 2. The description of the patient's initial condition is brief and lacks some specifics. 3. The abstract mentions the treatments given but does not explain the rationale for giving those treatments. It is important to briefly explain why each treatment was chosen. For example: "The patient was put on oxygen to alleviate hypoxia, doxycycline to prevent secondary bacterial infections, and prednisone to reduce inflammation." 4. The timeline and specific details of the complications (haematemesis and renal function deterioration) are not well detailed. 5. The process leading to the diagnosis of acute tubulointerstitial nephropathy is not described. 6. Correcting a few typographical errors and sentence structures is necessary. I have highlighted them in the main article <p>Introduction The introduction is detailed enough. However, it will be worthwhile to connect the problem statement, the literature, and your objectives. There should be a clear rationale for why this case study was worthwhile.</p> <p>Methods Begin the case report by explicitly stating its objective. The methodology should provide a more comprehensive explanation of the data collection process. The methodology should provide detailed information about the specific diagnostic instruments used, the criteria used to determine inclusion, and the process of excluding alternative causes of symptoms.</p> <p>Case Presentations This section is comprehensive and enlightening. However, we could simplify certain sections to improve comprehensibility. Please include a better-organized chronology of the individual's symptoms, medical interventions, and resulting effects. To enhance readability, it is advisable to separate the physical examination findings from the interventions and test results. A table or separate paragraph should contain the patient's history, medical records, and the results of the tests conducted. The case presentation should include the biopsy results. I am curious to know if serum electrolytes were performed for the patient.</p> <p>Discussion The discussion is comprehensive and encompasses several facets of bee sting envenomation.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<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>Nevertheless, it would be advantageous to concentrate more on the distinctive elements of this specific scenario. Analyze this case in relation to other documented cases for clinical manifestations, complications, and results. In this particular instance, examine and evaluate any constraints or shortcomings in the administration or diagnostic procedure. There was no connection between this study and other reported cases, as well as the clinical relevance or pathophysiology of the patient's parameters. An explicit explanation of the patient's altered parameters is necessary.</p> <p>Conclusion Major highlights from the case report should be stated.</p> <p>The manuscript demonstrates overall scientific accuracy. However, to improve clarity, comprehensiveness, and coherence, several aspects need improvement. Section 4 above has highlighted these aspects.</p> <p>As a source of information, the writers cited twenty studies that were published in contemporary international scientific journals. There is a preponderance of recent references, which indicates that the authors did adequate and extensive literature reviews.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A reasonable amount of clarity is achieved in the rendering of the English language, and the use of relevant scientific vocabulary is included. It is also important for the authors to proofread their work for errors in language and punctuation.</p>	
<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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Obodo Basil Nnaemeka</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Purdue University, United States</p>