

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79258
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of NS1 Antigen detection by Rapid Immunochromatography Test and ELISA for early diagnosis of Dengue at a Government General Hospital, Ananthapuramu
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	The discussion is very short, and the results are not discussed with the previous studies in detail. The authors need to rewrite the discussion.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There is no line number to point out the problems. In the abstract, remove extra spaces between "dengue patients." "Detection using" and "was considered".</p> <p>In the introduction, section describe the dengue fever season, morbidity and mortality rate, and severity in different age groups. Also, describe the dengue virus genome, its proteins.</p> <p>There are several typographical and grammatical errors. The line numbers are missing, so it is difficult to point out the mistake; however, I have identified a few. Therefore, the authors should check the whole manuscript for these kinds of errors.</p> <p>In conclusion, it should be ELISA not elisa, and what are RDTs? Write its full form.</p> <p>The inclusion criteria section sentence is incomplete in the materials and methods section. Why are exclusion criteria colored?</p> <p>j mitra kits were obtained from where write its country of origin name.</p> <p>Provide a brief method in the Materials and methods section for Test 1 and 2.</p> <p>All the results was analyzed and entered into spread excel sheet. In this sentence, it is "were" not "was."</p> <p>In the results section, the caption of Table 1 is not in its correct place.</p> <p>"Sensitivity, specificity, when only NS1 was considered on RDT kits when compared with ELISA were 93.33%, 98.57%, Table 3".....in this sentence, the fonts type is different from the rest of the manuscript, and remove Table 3 at the end of this sentence.</p> <p>In Table 3, it should be ELISA not elisa.</p> <p>The font type of word Discussion is different from the rest of the manuscript.</p>	
Optional/General comments	Please check the whole manuscript for grammar mistakes	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sahibzada Waheed
Department, University & Country	State Key Laboratory of Veterinary Etiological Biology, Lanzhou Veterinary Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences ,China