



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_30257
Title of the Manuscript:	EARLY RECOGNITION OF MALARIA OR DENGUE COMPLICATED WITH THROMBOCYTOPENIA
Type of the 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 (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	1) The problems in the field of discussed theme are well described in the Introduction. 2) The study is well structured; the Methodology is described in details and clearly, following logical process of the study. 3) The Results are demonstrative, <u>statistical analysis is storgng but is not clearly visible due to lack of p on the Tables.</u> 4) <u>Discussions only confirms the Results but there is not comparing with other studies.</u> 4) The Conclusions are correct and obtained directly from the Results of the study. 5) Acknowledgements (if are available), Competing Interests, Authors' Contributions are missing in the structure of the paper. 6) The most of References (45%) are from the last five years with enough contemporary studies. The sources are cited correctly. <u>There is need of improvement of writing according to the rules of citing.</u> 7) About the Tables – <u>- There is a rebundant repetition of the data in the text, the tables and “images”!!!</u> <u>- Instead “Image” should be written “Figure”!!!</u> <u>- There are too many Tables. This provokes difficulties in clear reading and understanding the advantages of the study.</u> 8) The English grammar and style are good.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	As the authors conclude, “the changes in these clinical, hematological and biochemical parameters can suggest some differentiation between malaria and dengue which may be very useful in remote areas or when facilities for specific diagnosis are limited or not available.” The aim of the study is good.	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Galya Ivanova Gancheva</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Infectious Diseases, Epidemiology, Parasitology and Tropical Medicine, Medical University – Pleven, Bulgaria</i>