

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_116675
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Implementation of a standardised Clinical Decision Support Algorithm for Fever
Type of the Article	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>This manuscript is important to scientific community. The study aims to design a decision support tool aligning with WHO and Nigerian National guidelines, enabling clinicians to administer quality treatment consistently. Through structured assessment and algorithmic guidance, the system identifies emergencies, recommends stabilisation actions, and facilitates optimal care and data transmission. Mixed-methods approach validates its efficacy, though further testing is warranted.</p> <p>Yes, Title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>Yes abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Its is better if the minimum heading use for writing article with subsections.</p> <p>Yes manuscript is properly written.</p> <p>Needs to review recent last three years research papers, most of the papers are too old.</p> <p>Authors has not mention qualitative and quantitative information in abstract. The body temperature must be map with other symptoms of the body, so that descion will be accurate. and drugs recommendation will be effective.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes no issue with English language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Article presents a comprehensive approach to improving fever management through a tailored decision support system. By aligning with WHO and Nigerian National guidelines, the study effectively addresses the need for standardized care. The mixed-methods approach, incorporating quantitative data collection and qualitative insights from focus group discussions, adds depth to the evaluation process. Results indicate improved systematic workflow and enhanced communication among clinicians, emphasizing the professional benefits of the decision support system. However, the call for further testing highlights the ongoing refinement necessary to optimize its effectiveness and evidence base.</p> <p>Authors has not mentioned the limitation and challenges for design and implementation of this system.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Sandeep Bhad
Department, University & Country	Rungta College of Engineering and Technology, India