



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRID_48417 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Pathogenesis and Immune-response in Dengue haemorrhagic fever |
| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>The Pathogenesis and Immune-response in Dengue haemorrhagic fever</p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The topic is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p>-Material and methods: It seems that the article is a review of the literature, or a mix between that and an opinion article or Essay.</p> <p>Two different types of literature review research are available: systematic review and non-systematic review or narrative review (update). The traditional method of review of the literature has been the narrative review, but it has two basic weaknesses. First, there is no rule on how to obtain primary data and how to integrate results; that is the subjective criterion of the reviewer. Second, the narrative reviewer does not synthesize quantitatively the data found in the different publications; therefore, these revisions are very susceptible to inaccuracies and biases.</p> <p>-Discussion: The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, etc.).</p> <p>-Argumentation: It is fundamental in opinion articles. The author should try to defend his thesis and arguments through the contribution of data and references, reasons, and examples of different situations. Likewise, it is advisable to also show a vision opposite to the one exposed. I suggest, for a better understanding of the readers, that the author synthesize and summarize in a Table their reflections, and data. To helping the reader to think clearly, one suggestion is to write the arguments for and against in a Table.</p> <p>-Keywords For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search)</p> | <p>Material and methods: The Article was submitted as a Narrative Review – and, that is what the Article is meant to be. As such, in the manner the respected Reviewer observes it is an update of that the Article-title wishes to deliver. The authors are not unaware of systematic-reviews, and non-systematic reviews (Coping reviews) which are generally very rigid and structured in Methodology (systematic, more than non-systematic) following generally and globally accepted rigid Methodology. But, both such Reviews tend to be confining, only addressing sub-topics in a broader (health here) concern. There is a need some time to view the matter in a broader and encompassing manner – here Narrative Reviews being suitable. Narrative Reviews not only allow quantitative data from Original Research and Meta-analysis to reviewed in a knowledge-synthesis, such also allow utilising and reviewing existing systematic-reviews and Coping reviews and Basic-science Research on sub-topics within the broader concern. Primary-data necessarily needs to be from Literature Review and from the author (s) own expertise a little subjectivity being unavoidable. Where more than one Literature exists on the same sub-topic such Literature can be compared, but where such are single, than such Literature need to be included as stand-alone findings and concepts, awaiting validation and corroborative-evidence. Inaccuracies and biases could exist but very minimally. Inadequate-samples, incorrect design, erroneous analytic statistics are more applicable to Original Research, systematic-reviews, Coping reviews and meta-analyses, in the view of the authors. Reviews are essentially knowledge-synthesis for readership - Pawson et al (2005) in describing Realist Reviews “The aim is to enable decision-makers to reach a deeper understanding of the intervention and how it can be made to work most effectively. Realist review does not provide simple answers to complex questions. It will not tell policy-makers or managers whether something works or not, but will provide the policy and practice community with the kind of rich, detailed and highly practical understanding of complex social interventions which is likely to be of much more use to them when planning and implementing programmes at a national, regional or local level.”</p> <p>The authors have not excluded looking at opposing-views (visions), but frequently such may not exist – particularly in the area of dengue hemorrhagic fever in the manner of the title of this Article.</p> <p>In accepting the respected Reviewers comments for Revision, the authors have attempted to Tabulate some aspects of the Results and Discussion. List of key-words have also been amended to confine to MeSH Headings.</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Optional/General comments | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|

PART 2:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |