



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_43406
Title of the Manuscript:	Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) analysis: An important tool to differentiate between Bacterial Meningitis and Viral Meningitis
Type of the Article	Original 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 (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	Introduction - Line 32: should read...However, the death toll due to.....reduced to <15% when there was appropriate treatment(4) - Line 34: meningitis..... - Line 37.....between viral meningitis and..... - Line 39: laboratory tests. In addition,.... - Line 41: please give full meaning of CT & MRI before abbreviation. - Line 43: ...and glucose values could....type of meningitis(11, 13). - Line 44 -46: recast sentence to bring out meaning of what you want to convey. - Line 47: no literature was cited. - Line 48-51: this study changes in suspected.....meningitis cases... such as..... discrimating between bacterial..... MATERIALS AND METHODS: This lacked sufficient details of methods/processes. No method was given/cited. Should include how samples were collected/whose method, ages of patients not broken into age-ranges; how csf/blood culture was carried out; Gram stain; isolation/identification of bacteria; leucocyte count; protein; lactate;glucose etc. No case definition; CRP not done to rule out viral meningitis. RESULTS: This was not reported based on the experiment carried out. The result of the sampling could be broken into age- range/genda and presented as table to which it could be referred to; result of the culture/ isolation & identification be given. And perhaps which age- range had highest bacterial infection etc. how many samples were culture positive. Results of csf chemical analysis should also be given. In addition, the findings on the questionnaires be well presented also. The author had chosen p<0.05 as his level of significance. Logical presentation of results will bring out the out- come of this work beautifully with the clinical presentations. In addition, serological investigation could be carried out on <i>N.meningitidis</i> isolates to identify their serogroups. ABSTRACT: The abstract should be re-written to reflect the observations on the methodology and results.	- Corrected - corrected - corrected - corrected - corrected - corrected - done - modified - corrected Modified
Minor REVISION comments	DISCUSSION: the author discussed his results logically linking the clinical presentation and the relevance of CSF analysis to differentiate bacterial meningitis from viral meningitis. The references are adequate and relevant.	
Optional/General comments	The author has done creditably well. The findings of this work will serve as guide to clinicians both on the relevant laboratory investigations and interpretation of such tests especially in tropical countries grappling with flare in meningitis- seasonal and non-seasonal alike.	