

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_130891
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical, Hematological and Biochemical Profile of Dengue Syndromes in Children
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the clinical, hematological, and biochemical profiles of pediatric dengue syndromes. Given the increasing burden of dengue in endemic regions like Bangladesh, the study fills a crucial knowledge gap by identifying early predictors of severity. These findings can significantly aid clinicians in early diagnosis, risk stratification, and management of pediatric dengue cases, potentially reducing morbidity and mortality. Additionally, the study’s emphasis on biochemical markers, such as hypocalcemia and hypoalbuminemia, provides new perspectives for better disease monitoring and intervention strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Clinical, Hematological and Biochemical Profile of Dengue Syndromes in Children", is clear and relevant. However, it could be more specific by reflecting the study's scope and objective. Suggested alternative title “Hematological and Biochemical Markers of Severe Dengue in Hospitalized Children: A Cross-Sectional Study in Bangladesh”	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The methodology lacks the necessary robustness to identify early diagnostic markers effectively. Serial measurements over time would be required to establish the temporal progression of hematological and biochemical changes, thereby validating their role as early predictors of severe dengue. The current cross-sectional design captures data at a single time point, which limits its ability to confirm causality or progression of disease severity. Furthermore, the conclusion is not fully supported by the study's methodology. While the findings provide important associations between laboratory parameters and severe dengue, the absence of serial measurements weakens the claim that these markers enable early detection. To strengthen the conclusion, the study should either incorporate longitudinal data or revise the statement to reflect its actual scope—identifying potential risk indicators rather than definitive early predictors.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	he study is scientifically sound and based on validated clinical and laboratory parameters.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes relevant references, but there are areas for improvement: Some references are older than 10 years (e.g., Shah et al. 2006), and should be updated with more recent literature. More global comparative studies (e.g., from WHO, PAHO, CDC reports) should be included. If possible, cite a meta-analysis or systematic review to strengthen the literature review. Suggest to add A recent systematic review on hematological changes in severe dengue. Studies on biochemical predictors of dengue severity in other regions (e.g., Southeast Asia, Latin America).	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language is generally clear and professional, but there are grammatical errors and awkward sentence structures in multiple sections.</p> <p>The introduction has long and complex sentences that could be rewritten for clarity.</p> <p>The discussion has repetitive phrases, making it less concise.</p> <p>Some technical terms (e.g., “expended dengue syndrome” should be “expanded dengue syndrome”) need correction.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript presents comprehensive tables (Table 4 to Table 8) detailing hematological and biochemical parameters across different dengue syndromes. However, the statistical tests used for analysis are not explicitly mentioned in the results or table legends. Given that comparisons between different patient groups are essential for establishing significant differences, it is crucial to specify whether chi-square tests, t-tests, ANOVA, or non-parametric tests were used. Additionally, p-values are provided in some tables but lack interpretation in the text. Without clarity on statistical methods, the validity of the reported associations remains unclear. Suggest to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clearly state the statistical tests used in the methods section and table captions.Provide justification for selecting specific tests, particularly if data were normally or non-normally distributed.Ensure p-values are interpreted within the text, rather than just reported in tables. <p>The literature review and discussion rely heavily on Bangladeshi and South Asian studies while lacking global perspectives from other dengue-endemic regions, such as Southeast Asia and Latin America. Given that dengue epidemiology, clinical presentation, and severity predictors vary geographically, a broader comparative analysis would enhance the manuscript’s impact and generalizability. Suggest to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Incorporate global studies from WHO, PAHO, and CDC reports to provide a more comprehensive understanding of pediatric dengue.Compare findings with research from Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa to determine regional similarities and differences in dengue severity markers.Consider adding meta-analyses or systematic reviews that provide a high-level synthesis of hematological and biochemical predictors in severe dengue. <p>The discussion lacks focus and contains general descriptions of results, which do not contribute to an assessment of predictive value. Instead of restating numerical findings, the authors should explicitly analyze how each clinical, hematological, and biochemical marker predicts severity. The discussion should be structured around the study’s objectives, ensuring that each major result is interpreted in terms of its clinical significance and predictive utility.</p> <p>Although the study reports hematological and biochemical abnormalities, it does not adequately explain their underlying pathophysiology. The manuscript should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide a mechanistic explanation of how these biomarkers reflect pathophysiological changes in severe dengue.Discuss whether these abnormalities are early markers or late complications, to better guide clinical decision-making. <p>The manuscript claims that the study identifies early predictors of severe dengue; however, its cross-sectional design limits its ability to track disease progression over time. Serial measurements at multiple time points are necessary to determine whether these biomarkers appear early in the disease course or only in severe cases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Acknowledge the limitations of a cross-sectional study in detecting early predictors.Modify the conclusion to state that the findings identify associations with severity but require longitudinal validation for early detection. <p>Several parts of the discussion repeat information already presented in the results section, without</p>	

Review Form 3

	adding further analysis. Additionally, prevalence rates and numerical data are reiterated multiple times, instead of being synthesized into broader themes. Focus on interpretation and clinical significance rather than excessive data reporting.	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amaranath Karunanayake
Department, University & Country	University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka