

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_118704
Title of the Manuscript:	The “Baseline widal titre” amongst apparently healthy adults working at a tertiary care medical institution, a pilot study, Uttarakhand.
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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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. This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it provides groundbreaking insights that advance knowledge, inspire future research, and foster interdisciplinary innovation.</p> <p>2. As in introduction first the author mentioned typhoid, they need to mention typhoid in title as well.</p> <p>3. Yes but need adjustment.</p> <p>4. They need to add few things such as: funding source, conclusion.</p> <p>5. The manuscript need another look for adjustment.</p> <p>6. Reference section is almost ok.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author takes 110 samples for writing the research paper, are you sure is this enough for correct study? The study didn't mentions the collection of blood samples from "suspects" both male and female. How were these suspects chosen, and were there any specific criteria or symptoms that guided their selection? Based on the findings, what specific interventions or public health measures do the authors recommend for the Uttarakhand region to better control and manage typhoid? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is good enough.</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:

Name:	Tanveer Khan
Department, University & Country	Bacha Khan University, Pakistan