

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_129451
Title of the Manuscript:	DENGUE IN GUINEA: CLINICAL DESCRIPTION AND INVESTIGATION OF AN IMPORTED CASE
Type of the Article	

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 is important for the scientific community as it sheds light on the challenges of diagnosing imported dengue fever in regions where the disease is not endemic. It highlights the potential delays in diagnosis due to overlapping symptoms with other common tropical illnesses and underscores the need for more rapid and accurate diagnostic techniques, such as RT-PCR. Additionally, the case emphasizes the importance of surveillance systems that incorporate cross-border cooperation and the sequencing of viral strains to better understand the spread of dengue. This report serves as a valuable reference for improving disease detection and response strategies in West Africa and other regions where dengue may be an emerging concern.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	

Review Form 3

<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>Additions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Public Health Impact: Include a brief mention of the potential public health implications of imported dengue fever, especially in regions with limited resources.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Example: "This case underscores the need for robust surveillance systems to prevent the potential spread of dengue fever in non-endemic areas."2. Patient Outcome: While the abstract describes the diagnosis process, it does not mention the final outcome for the patient. Was the patient treated successfully? Including this detail would provide closure. <p>Deletions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. RT-PCR CT Value: While the CT value is a technical detail, its relevance could be better explained, or it could be omitted if not crucial to the case's interpretation.	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Potential Issues to Verify in the Manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. RT-PCR and CT Value: The mention of a CT value of 31.27 aligns with standard practices for diagnosing dengue, but it would be essential to confirm the lab protocols and interpretation of this value.2. No Epidemiological Link: The statement that "no epidemiological link was found" requires detailed evidence. The manuscript should describe the methods used to search for links (e.g., travel history, contact tracing).	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes , Sufficient</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the abstract is generally clear and understandable, but it could benefit from refinements to enhance its professionalism, flow, and suitability for scholarly communication. Below are some observations and suggestions:</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conciseness: The abstract includes unnecessary details (e.g., exact dates of symptom onset and self-medication) that could be summarized for brevity. 2. Consistency in Tense: Scholarly abstracts typically use the past tense for completed actions and the present tense for general facts or conclusions. The current text occasionally shifts tenses. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Objective Evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scientific Accuracy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The manuscript provides a scientifically accurate account of an imported dengue fever case, including clinical details and diagnostic methods. o The RT-PCR test and its CT value are appropriately referenced, indicating reliable diagnostic practices. 2. Relevance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The topic is highly relevant, addressing the growing concerns of vector-borne diseases in non-endemic regions and the importance of cross-border surveillance. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mukul Mudgal</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Noida International University, India</p>