

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_129816
Title of the Manuscript:	Revisiting Dengue in Nigeria: Epidemiological Analysis, Current Trends and Recommendations
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.	Author has understood the epidemiological importance of Dengue as an extremely important disease in context of Nigeria as a nation. He then has made an effort to collate and review data from his own country over past few decades ,tracing the historical trend in prevalence and distribution of cases along with advances in investigative modalities in isolating and identifying the virus. This kind of systematic review by other authors and researchers in other tropical countries with high burden of vector borne diseases would go along way in formulating robust mechanisms for surveillance and early identification of Dengue.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	THE TITLE SEEMS TO BE SUITABLE AND ALLIGNED WITH WHAT THE AUTHOR WANTS TO HIGHLIGHT.	
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.	Given the limits on words for abstract ,the abstract seem to be comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Author has declared that they have used secondary data sources and the fact that this is a review article ,within the limited scope of this article the manuscript looks scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Because this review article specifically focuses on one country the references seem to be appropriate and adequate.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Authors should refrain from using adjectives and terms which are less scientific, like scourge,threat,looms large, Thesis of this calibre, illuminates etc and should use scientific alternatives conveying what they want to convey. Also check the spelling again,eg. ELIZA Should be ELISA.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I wish them all the best for their future endeavours in research.	

#### 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:	Sunil Junagde
Department, University & Country	Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, India