



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_20420
Title of the Manuscript:	H1N1 - One Year Follow Up Study
Type of the Article	Short 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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The aim of the study is unclear. Please clarify the objectives. The introduction section is related to the results and methods, whereas in the objective section there is a brief literature review to provide a rationale for the study. The study design appears only in the abstract. The study is either cross-sectional or prospective, cannot be both. However, it seems to be a case series. In the methods section, there is no indication of the study site. The time frame to select the participants was very short, resulting in a small sample size. That is why this should be a case series and not a cross-sectional study as indicated. Why were the patients contacted by letter? Why wasn't the consent form obtained from family members during the hospital stay, providing access to clinical data? The information provided over the phone by the five patients who refused to participate, cannot be confirmed by the researchers. The discussion section does not compare the findings of the study with those of other published papers. In short, there is little discussion of the results. The conclusion section is extensive, but does not relate to the goals. Quality of life is mentioned in the objectives, but there are no data in the article.	Dear Reviewer many thanks for those important comments. 1. Aim of the study is clarified. 2. Changed the study to case series. 3. Study site is mentioned along with time frame. 4. These 12 were the only patients admitted with H1N1 in that intensive care at the pandemic era. 5. This was a follow up study after a year of the disease – hence no previous consent were taken. 6. Discussion section the findings are compared . 7. Conclusion is changed 8. Several other changes are made as seemed important
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abbreviations and acronyms should be written in full in the text on their first appearance. There are some typos that should be corrected in the revision.	Tried to change as much as possible
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a case series study that requires substantial review as mentioned in the different sections. Even though some hypotheses were raised, the data made little contribution to conclude something.	