



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_41090
Title of the Manuscript:	Dengue virus infection among suspected yellow fever patients in Ghana
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 1, Title must explain your work and gives a general idea about your work, your title need more information (incomplete title) Line 11, why 360 patients? Explain that briefly Line 15 to 21, use only percentage or only numbers or if you want use both you should put both everywhere of this paragraph Line 47, more details needed to support your idea about why you used suspected yellow fever patients Line 137, in which year is the reference? Line 169, why 44% females and 56% males? Why not 50/50% for example? Line 172, The number of the table is missing Line 175, The number of the table is missing Line 178, The number of the table is missing Line 193, The number of the table is missing Line 203, The number of the table is missing	Line 1: Title has been modified to read 'detection of dengue virus from suspected yellow fever samples' Line 11: These were the available achieved samples Lines 15-21 have been modified accordingly Line 137: 1992 is the year of reference. Line 69: As mentioned in line 11, they were achieved samples. Line 72: It is Table 1 Line 175: It is Table 1 Line 178: It is Table 1 Line 193: It is Table 2 Line 203: It is Table 4
Minor REVISION comments	Line 7, any reference? Line 26, you can add ELISA as a key word Line 40, any reference? Line 76, any differences between fresh and archived samples? maybe gives us different results? Line 95, any reference? Line 107, any reference? Line 235, any reference? Line 243, any reference supports this issue?	Line 7: It is part of the abstract and therefore does not need a reference. Line 26: ELISA has been added. Line 40: A reference has been cited [Kalayanarooj et al, 1997] Line 76: It is possible but we did not test fresh samples. Line 95 Line 107 Line 235: A reference has been cited [Chaterji et al, 2011; Solanke et al, 2015] Line 243:
Optional/General comments	Few paragraphs need to be paraphrased especially in (background and discussion) paragraphs	