

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71093
Title of the Manuscript:	Presenting features and clinical profile of scrub typhus fever cases in a tertiary care hospital
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. There are many typographical and grammatical errors, including missing punctuations, inconsistencies, and unitalicized species names, throughout the manuscript. Please proof-read carefully. You may simply use Microsoft word's spell check function for this purpose.</p> <p>2. The gap of knowledge and purpose of this study has not been clearly stated. Please explore deeper rather than just stating "To determine the clinical profile and manifestations of scrub typhus among people." Explore problems that need to be addressed that justify the objective of study. Is this area endemic for scrub typhus? Is there a high chigger mite vector prevalence? What are the epidemiological data (annual prevalence, seasonal trends, morbidity, or mortality rates, etc.) for scrub typhus, particularly in this study area?</p> <p>3. The methods have not been clearly described. Is this study using secondary patient data or were the recruited suspected study participants subjected to tests to diagnose scrub typhus? It would be logical to explain the methods starting from ethical considerations, demographical data collection, patient history description, physical examination, and additional laboratory examination (Weil-Felix test, serological detection of IgM against <i>Orientia tsutsugamushi</i>). What are the serological methods used for IgM detection? If an in-house method was used, please elaborate on the test performance. If a kit was used, please mention the name/company of the kit.</p> <p>4. It would be better if the authors could add more demographic data, especially those related to scrub typhus risk factors, such as occupation or area of residence. Instead of just descriptively presenting the data, please add statistical analysis to correlate data of certain demographics with the clinical manifestations and development of severe disease/complications. This way, the study would have more impact.</p> <p>5. The discussion did not align with the results. If drug resistance becomes a concern, please add data on treatment history and its correlation to the development of complications/clinical symptoms in the results.</p> <p>6. The conclusion did not align with the objective of the study. The authors mentioned "early detection" when the results themselves did not describe when these patients were diagnosed (after how many days of symptom onset? Did this affect the clinical outcomes?)</p> <p>7. Please address the informed consent process of the study participants.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The abstract is wordy and contains statements that could have been omitted. Please re-write it to be more concise.</p> <p>2. Please make sure to finish the sentences properly. There were several ". . . & ." in this manuscript, indicating that the manuscript has not been thoroughly checked prior to submission.</p> <p>3. Please make sure to check that all references have been cited properly in the corresponding sentences since some were found to be incorrectly cited. Reference manager software, such as Endnote or Mendeley, could greatly serve this purpose.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Patient data should provide much more information than the ones described in this study. Those data might have more significance than those stated here. Please explore and elaborate more to improve the impact of this study.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aulia Rahmi Pawestri
Department, University & Country	Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia