



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>)

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. Unlike for the national health care survey for yellow fever, approval from a human <u>research</u> ethics committee is needed because you are going to publish the results. 2. You categorized the incidences of dengue by patients' age and their living region but, as shown in the tables, numbers of patients classified by these 2 parameters were obviously different. None of positive result detected in 8 residents of Northern did not mean that no dengue infection in this region. Actually, total number of 360 samples cannot be a representative of total population of Ghana.	1. Because the samples were collected for surveillance activities, no ethical clearance was needed. However, for the dengue studies, we sought permission from the Disease Surveillance Department and protected the confidentiality of participants. 2. Yes, the sample size is small and may not be representative. This is a limitation of the study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		