

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_129389
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological, clinical and prognosis aspects of tetanus in the Department of Infectious and Tropical Diseases in Dakar, 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: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds a significant importance in the scientific community due to its implications for public health, immunology and infectious diseases management. It addresses both the biological mechanisms of tetanus and its broader societal impact and lastly, It will likely contribute to reducing morbidity by enhancing scientific understanding of infectious diseases	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	I would like to suggest an addition to be made in the METHODOLOGY SECTION in the ABSTRACT, the authors should kindly elaborate further in order to provide more details and insight about the manuscript for a reader	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes it is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	In my view; The references are Sufficient considering the context of the manuscript	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it's, but a bits of grammatical errors should be look up for adjustments	
Optional/General comments	In my opinion, the heading "PATIENT AND METHODS" should not be used. In lieu, "METHODS " alone should be use as a heading - then follow by the " study design and participants " as a sub-heading of the METHODS	

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:	Rahama sanusi karama
Department, University & Country	Noida international university, India