



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_37429
Title of the Manuscript:	A FIVE YEARS RETROSPECTIVE STUDY ON ETIOLOGY AND CLINICAL ANALYSIS OF MENINGITIS IN ST.PAUL'S HOSPITAL MILLENNIUM MEDICAL COLLEGE PEDIATRIC WARD IN 2012-2016
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The paper is not written in the format provided by the journal (can be found in the journal's website). 2) The introduction is long, keeps repeating itself, making hard to follow the paper. 3) English needs to be improved – it also makes the paper hard to follow. 4) Total word count is 6765, which exceeds the maximum suggested at the author guidelines (3000 – 6000 words in total). 5) Lines 231 – 232 → According to the second inclusion criterion, it could be that some cases of meningitis were diagnosed empirically, without ever obtaining CSF. This could lead to flaws in the study. How many patients were they? Why they were not excluded? Couldn't it be viral meningitis or even no meningitis at all? 6) Lines 283 – 291 → Expected outcomes of the study? Couldn't this be implemented (very very shortly) in the significance of the study? 7) The authors do not show any data on the antibiotics used. 8) Shouldn't there be a comparison between the characteristics of the patients that had different outcomes? That would allow to draw conclusions on risk factors for mortality or neurologic sequale etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. I tried to reduce some redundancies from introduction part. 5. Unfortunately every of cases were confirmed by CSF. 6 .Expected outcomes is a sole requirement for our country but it seems significant I will omit it. 7. Every meningitis in our country managed by a third generation cephalosporin mainly by ceftraxone. 8. The study was descriptive type.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lines 149 – 152 → Citation needed 2) Lines 165 – 166 → Retype – not clear what author wants to say 3) Line 208 → Replace 'will be' with 'was' 4) Line 234 → Replace 'included in' with 'excluded from' 5) Lines 262 – 267 → Operational definition? Is this truly necessary to be in the paper? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. And mainly used by..... 5. Great comment we can omit it.
Optional/General comments		