

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_123497
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Associated with Deaths Among COVID-19 Patients Managed at Epidemic Treatment Centers (CTEs) in Decentralized Areas in Senegal
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>The manuscript titled "Factors Associated with Deaths Among COVID-19 Patients Managed at Epidemic Treatment Centers (CTEs) in Decentralized Areas in Senegal" is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the risk factors associated with COVID-19 mortality in a specific regional context. This study highlights critical elements like advanced age, male gender, and complications such as ARDS and stroke, all of which are crucial for understanding patient outcomes during the pandemic. The study's focus on a decentralized region in Senegal adds to the global understanding of COVID-19's impact in different healthcare settings, especially in lower-resource areas.</p> <p>I appreciate the manuscript for its clear methodology, the use of multivariate analysis to determine risk factors, and its relevance in informing future public health strategies. However, it could have explored more on vaccination status and its effects, as this variable remains underreported.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Factors Associated with Deaths Among COVID-19 Patients Managed at Epidemic Treatment Centers (CTEs) in Decentralized Areas in Senegal," is informative and clearly conveys the focus of the study. However, it can be refined for better clarity and impact. Here's an alternative suggestion:</p> <p>"Risk Factors for COVID-19 Mortality in Epidemic Treatment Centers: A Case-Control Study from Decentralized Regions of Senegal"</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>	<p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study, including the introduction, methods, results, and conclusion. However, there are a few areas where improvements can be made to ensure better clarity and comprehensiveness:</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <p>Contextualization: The abstract could benefit from a brief mention of why the study in decentralized areas of Senegal is particularly important or unique.</p> <p>Suggestion: A sentence at the beginning could emphasize the significance of studying COVID-19 mortality in decentralized and resource-limited settings.</p> <p>Methodological Clarity: The methodology section is detailed but could be clearer about how cases and controls were selected.</p> <p>Suggestion: Mention the criteria for selecting controls (recovered patients) in more detail for added clarity.</p> <p>Key Findings on Vaccination: The vaccination data in the results section is notable but underrepresented in the abstract. Given that vaccination is a major public health intervention, this point should be mentioned.</p> <p>Suggestion: Add a line about the low vaccination rates and their impact on the results.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to have a well-organized structure, but there are a few areas where the subsections could be enhanced for clarity and readability. Here are some suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Subsection Headings:</p> <p>Introduction: This section could benefit from being divided into two smaller subsections, such as "Background" and "Objective," to clearly distinguish the general context from the specific purpose of the study.</p> <p>Results: The results section could include clear subheadings such as "Demographic Characteristics," "Clinical Features," and "Multivariate Analysis" to make the findings more organized and easier to navigate.</p> <p>Discussion: This section might be further broken down into "Interpretation of Findings," "Comparison with Other Studies," and "Limitations" to improve the flow and ensure all key points are covered.</p> <p>Add a "Study Limitations" Section:</p> <p>This section is crucial to acknowledge the limitations of the study, such as the observational nature of the study, regional specificity, or data gaps (e.g., vaccination status missing for some patients).</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Addition of a "Public Health Implications" Section: A short section on how the findings can be applied to public health strategies, especially in decentralized regions, would strengthen the practical value of the manuscript.</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>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive approach to the research problem, employing well-established methodologies and rigorous data analysis. The authors have ensured technical soundness by adhering to standard protocols and providing detailed descriptions of their experimental procedures, which enhances reproducibility. The manuscript also includes a thorough review of relevant literature, aligning the findings with current scientific knowledge and validating the results through appropriate statistical methods. Additionally, the discussion section effectively contextualizes the findings within the broader field, addressing potential limitations and suggesting future research directions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally adequate and reflect a good understanding of the relevant literature. They include both recent studies and key foundational works pertinent to the research topic.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript meets the criteria of clarity, precision, grammar, syntax, consistency, readability so its likely suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Larisa Adela Udriștioiu
Department, University & Country	Carol Davila University of Medicine and Pharmacy or University, Romania