



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>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Jose Luis Turabian</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Spain</i>