



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRID_48440</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CNS manifestations in probable case of rickettsial infections in children</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract: Line 16 : Youngest instead of “most youngest”.</li> <li>2. Results: Line 3: youngest instead of “most youngest”.</li> <li>3. I feel authors have based their diagnosis of rickettsial infection on screening tests, which is a huge limitation of this study. Though the authors have mentioned this limitation in their study, but I still feel authors can rename their study title as “CNS manifestations in children presenting clinically as rickettsial infections” or something similar, instead of saying that they are probably rickettsial infections. Large number of cases included in the study will turn out to be not of rickettsial origin.</li> <li>4. The references mentioned in reference list should be in standard Vancouver style of referencing.</li> <li>5. Majority of references are old (more than 5 yrs). Add newer references to give weightage to the article.</li> <li>6. Clinical Photographs of patients should be added.</li> </ol>	All the corrections have been incorporated in the manuscript
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	--	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Article can be accepted after correction according to review comments given.	

**PART 2:**

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	