



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_30700
Title of the Manuscript:	OTOGENIC TETANUS – A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND ANALYTICAL STUDY OF DATA AVAILABLE IN LITERATURE
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It appears the reviewed materials focused only on paediatric age group. Otogenic tetanus is not limited to paediatric group. Adults with csom can also have it as a form of complication. There are more data available in literature your search did not include. Your title can be modified to be " otogenic tetanus in children: a systemic review" this makes it simpler and not ambiguous. If you say..... Data available in literature. What happens to the ones you could not capture? The papers reviewed have no year limit. It would have been better to say papers not older than 10 years for example. This may help you focus on more recent papers.... It will be good to see a table showing how you searched for the papers you used and how you finally narrowed down to those that meant your inclusion criteria in your method section.	Thank you very much for the pains taken to review our article. Appreciate and respect your valuable suggestions as the reviewer. The title has been changed as per the suggestion. The focus on recent data has been highlighted in the methods section A table has been incorporated as a flow chart to highlight the method of data collection (see table 1)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In the introduction section there was no reference seen. Is it that all the thoughts expressed in the introduction section are original? It would be good to see a few references.	Pertinent references have been added & same incorporated in the introduction section.