



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_44628
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Dengue Fever with Special Reference to Malaysia
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	1.Clinical manifestation section is less well organized. Proper and clear separation of the DF/DHF and DSS in different paragraphs would be easy for the reader to follow. May be a better idea is to tabulate the clinical features so easy the reader.	1. Reviewer's comments noted and action has been taken to add the subheadings of febrile, critical and convalescent phase. A small description on convalescent phase has been added- highlighted in yellow.
Minor REVISION comments	1.Excessively capitalized the first letter in many places in the article. This need correction Ex. - line 23,24,28 2. Line 39 – as the first appearance of DSS in the text, please write as Dengue Shock Syndrome (DSS), later use DSS. 3. Line 54-56 have been repeated 39-41 4. Section on pathogenesis (current understating), emphasis on sever dengue with recurrent infection by a different serotype.	1. Reviewer's comment noted and acted upon by the Authors 2. Noted and acted upon by Authors 3. Noted and acted upon by Authors 4. Noted, and a new part discussing the 'pathogenesis of severe dengue' has been added at the end of 'Clinical Management' and highlighted.
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There are ethical issues in this Manuscript except that declared by the Authors under Conflict of Interest.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_44628
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Dengue Fever with Special Reference to Malaysia
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	1.Clinical manifestation section is less well organized. Proper and clear separation of the DF/DHF and DSS in different paragraphs would be easy for the reader to follow. May be a better idea is to tabulate the clinical features so easy the reader.	1. Reviewer's comments noted and action has been taken to add the subheadings of febrile, critical and convalescent phase. A small description on convalescent phase has been added- highlighted in yellow.
Minor REVISION comments	1.Excessively capitalized the first letter in many places in the article. This need correction Ex. - line 23,24,28 2. Line 39 – as the first appearance of DSS in the text, please write as Dengue Shock Syndrome (DSS), later use DSS. 3. Line 54-56 have been repeated 39-41 4. Section on pathogenesis (current understating), emphasis on sever dengue with recurrent infection by a different serotype.	1. Reviewer's comment noted and acted upon by the Authors 2. Noted and acted upon by Authors 3. Noted and acted upon by Authors 4. Noted, and a new part discussing the 'pathogenesis of severe dengue' has been added at the end of 'Clinical Management' and highlighted.
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There are ethical issues in this Manuscript except that declared by the Authors under Conflict of Interest.