

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79037
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on epidemiology and risk factors for developing bacterial meningitis in children of Odisha, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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	Dear Editor, Indeed, the incidence of bacterial meningitis is one of the global problems in developing countries. The solution to this problem is the widespread use of prophylactic vaccines against circulating strains of pathogens. But for developing countries with low access to health care and vaccinations, this is a big problem. The authors describe in detail the methods and results of the research carried out. In general, the article is of scientific interest and is relevant and publishable. The article fully complies with the requirements for publications in this area. The style of writing the manuscript, the tables, and the illustrations are easy to understand. But at the same time, there are small remarks to the authors of the article: - Why were three different methods used to identify infectious agents? It would be logical to choose one of the methods, for example, real-time PCR. - I think it would be indicative if the authors provided a table with clinical and laboratory data (glucose, hemoglobin, CRP, procalcitonin, complete blood count ...)	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor notes: - page 7, the reference to table 3 does not correspond to reality. Perhaps the author was referring to table 4?	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kozhakhmetov Samat
Department, University & Country	National Laboratory Astana, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan