



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_28244
Title of the Manuscript:	Dengue Fever in Myasthenic Crisis
Type of the Article	Case study

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	As regards the "Introduction" and the "Presentation of the case", I've no comments to make. As regards the "Discussion" I think that it should be shortened. In particular, I consider uselessness to repeat sentences already present in the "Introduction", about the MG and the Dengue Fever. I don't think that any conclusion can be made about IVIg and MG from this case. I don't think that there was a significant delay in the response to IVIg: they need 15 days to work and the patients was discharged after 31 day (and there was a pneumonia in the meanwhile).	Repetitive statements within the "Introduction" and the "Discussion" sections were removed and rectified. In the "Introduction" section line 23-25, the statement has been changed along with a new reference to reflect the prevalence of dengue as an endemic disease in the local setting.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	none	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The case is interesting especially for the role of the virus in the progressive worsening of the weakness in the early part of the incubation period. It provide important information regarding the triggers and the management of myasthenic crisis in the acute phase. But I think that the "Discussion" and the "Conclusion" should be re-written.	The "Discussion" and the "Conclusion" has been rewritten with the role of plasma exchange as future alternative therapy in myasthenic crisis been highlighted.