

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_124322
Title of the Manuscript:	Early identification of sepsis among the patients triages via emergency severity index (ESI) from a tertiary care hospital of a low-income setting.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insight into using the Emergency Severity Index (ESI) to improve early sepsis identification in low-resource settings, which is crucial for reducing sepsis-related mortality. However, the study's practical implications could be better elaborated. For instance, how easily could the ESI tool be implemented in emergency departments in resource-constrained settings? There is limited discussion on the challenges of adoption, especially with respect to staffing, training, and infrastructure constraints.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title reflects the core idea of the study but could be revised for clarity. A suggestion: "Effectiveness of the Emergency Severity Index in Early Identification of Sepsis in a Tertiary Care Hospital of a Low-Resource Setting". This makes the focus on the effectiveness of the ESI tool more explicit.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The results section should more clearly highlight the critical findings regarding the sensitivity and specificity of the ESI tool in identifying sepsis and septic shock. <input type="checkbox"/> The background section is too lengthy and could be shortened to make space for clearer presentation of the objectives and findings. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure is generally acceptable.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The research is scientifically sound, but the statistical analysis could be explained more clearly for readers who are not experts in advanced statistical methods. For example, how were the cut-off points for sensitivity and specificity chosen? Additionally, there is little discussion of the clinical implications of having a high false-negative rate for sepsis identification using ESI II. How would this affect patient outcomes, and what alternative strategies could be employed?</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>While the references are mostly adequate, there are some older sources (e.g., studies from 2011 and 2007) that could be updated with more recent literature.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The phrase "This was necessary to implement a focused and effective triage tool" could be rewritten as "Implementing a focused and effective triage tool is essential."</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The discussion could also reflect on the global implications of the findings. How do the results from a low-resource setting like Pakistan compare to studies in more affluent healthcare systems? Would the ESI tool be equally applicable in different environments?</p> <p>This review focuses on the main strengths of the manuscript while identifying areas that need improvement to make the study more impactful and easier to comprehend for a broader audience.</p> <p>(Revisions are recommended, particularly in terms of expanding the discussion, updating references, and improving language clarity.)</p>	

Review Form 3

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>	No

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dian Sulistya Ekaputri
Department, University & Country	Udayana University, Indonesia