

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_113489
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON BETWEEN WIDAL TEST AND STOOL CULTURE IN THE DIAGNOSIS OF TYPHOID FEVER IN THE CLINICAL SET-UP IN NIGER DELTA REGION OF NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the study provide the significant contribution in detection of typhoid fever based on diagnosis.</p> <p>Yes, suitable</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Some modification require</p> <p>Slight modification to be done</p> <p>Some more reference are to be coated</p> <p>Reviewers comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes it is mentioned 400 patients instead of 400 samples , especially in study population • Clearly mention the age group of patients enrolled in the study (as it is said like ages ranging from less than 10 to 50years) • Ethical clearance number to be mentioned • Antibiotic sensitivity procedure to be elaborated clearly • Figure 3 text results explanation is not matching with Fig. 3 depicted. • Figure 4 text results explanation is not matching with Fig. 4 depicted. • Gender based test results are not available in figures. • Fig. 5b and 5c are not explained in results section. • Add some more references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Quite okay	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures should be self explainable with differentiable histograms • X axis and y axis labelling should be done. 	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S M. Biradar
Department, University & Country	BLDEA's SSM College of Pharmacy and Research Centre, India