

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	<b>In the developed world, Tetanus like life-threatening infection is rarely observed. However, it is still a curse to some African countries where the success of controlling Tetanus is still a dream. Consequently, this research has significant impact on the scientific community specially those conducting research on Tetanus like critical diseases.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Alternative title: Clinico-epidemiological and prognostic features of tetanus in Senegal.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>The authors tried to include maximum findings of the research in their abstract. The result section can be more precise where they can discuss the most important epidemiological, clinical and prognostic findings of tetanus, Additionally, they could write in one sentence why the study is rational.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	<p>Introduction: The author could use the term 'Our context', 'We'. Instead, they could use 'in the context of Senegal', 'this study' respectively.</p> <p>Method: I would like to request the authors to includes a short description about Mollaret stage and Dakar score with references under study design.</p> <p>Results: The authors tried to describe the results though they provided a table. Sadly, all the components they discussed were not evident in their tables and figures. My understanding is to briefly describe what components they have discussed in the table that could be written in the result section indicating table number and a full overview of the results people can read going through the tables. Therefore, my suggestion is to construct three tables including</p> <p>Table 1: epidemiological characteristics of the subjects ⇒ Age (Mean age and SD, proportion from different age groups), Sex (with M/F ratio), Swelling place (Urban/SubUrban/Rural), Occupation, Vaccinated/Non vaccinated.</p> <p>Table 2: Clinical characteristics ⇒ Portal of entry, hospital stay, main sign of tetanus on admission, incubation period, duration of invasion etc</p> <p>Table 3: Prognostic characteristics ⇒ Mollaret stage, treatment provided, antibiotic therapy, anti-tetanus, tracheotomy, complication.</p>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Unfortunately, I found all the references disorganised in the downloaded copy. I reckon no software was used to prepare the reference. I would request to use Endnote to prepare an organised and a readable reference	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	average	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>Please revise adequately to develop a better manuscript with better English.</b>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<b><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Avisak Bhattacharjee</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>University of Adelaide, Australia</b>