

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_123343
Title of the Manuscript:	Unravel the Enigma of Kawasaki Disease: Groping in the Dark.
Type of the Article	Review article

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>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it synthesizes current knowledge on a critical topic, potentially guiding future research directions. By highlighting key findings, identifying gaps, and proposing new perspectives, it contributes to a deeper understanding of the subject matter. I appreciate the manuscript for its comprehensive review, clarity, and thoughtful analysis, which can inspire innovative research and enhance practical applications in the field. However, a more detailed exploration of emerging trends could further elevate its impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article should ideally reflect its scope, key focus, and main findings, ensuring it captures the attention of the target audience.</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>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript should ensure a clear, logical progression of ideas, with each section contributing directly to the overall narrative. They must be clearly defined, consistently formatted, and comprehensive, avoiding extraneous information.</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 is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it integrates a comprehensive review of recent advancements in Kawasaki disease research, including genetic, molecular, and clinical aspects. The utilization of diverse methodologies, such as meta-analysis, pyrosequencing, and in vitro models, adds credibility to the findings and supports the proposed biomarkers and therapeutic strategies. The manuscript critically evaluates current knowledge and gaps, providing a well-rounded perspective on ongoing research. Its detailed analysis of various studies demonstrates a strong grasp of the subject matter, reinforcing the manuscript's scientific accuracy and relevance.</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 in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation for the discussion and analysis presented.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is clear and coherent, with appropriate scientific terminology and well-structured sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a thorough review of Kawasaki disease, integrating recent findings on genetics, biomarkers, and clinical aspects. To improve readability, better transitions between sections and additional visual aids are recommended. Highlighting future research directions and clinical implications could further enhance the manuscript's value.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Suresh
Department, University & Country	Meenakshi Medical College Hospital and Research Institute, India