

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|--|---|
| 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. | I find this manuscript to be a valuable contribution to the scientific community. It effectively highlights critical clinical, hematological, and biochemical markers that can predict the severity of pediatric dengue syndromes. The study’s emphasis on early detection and intervention is particularly relevant for improving patient outcomes. Additionally, the focus on an endemic region like Bangladesh enhances its global applicability, offering useful insights for clinical management in similar settings. |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)  | The title of the article is informative but could be more concise.<br><br>Suggested alternative title:<br>"Clinical, Hematological, and Biochemical Predictors of Severity in Pediatric Dengue Syndromes"  |   |
| 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 abstract is generally comprehensive but can be improved with a few changes: mention diagnostic criteria, better to mention the statistical tests applied, Briefly compare findings between DHF and DSS, like "Among DSS cases, 14.85% had severe thrombocytopenia (<20,000 cells/mm³) and 13.86% had elevated hematocrit levels (>45%), which were not as prevalent in DHF cases."   |   |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  | Overall, the manuscript is scientifically correct  |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                              | References are not up to the mark, please add some recent literature, specially in the discussion section  |   |

Review Form 3

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is not suitable needs to be refined for greater precision and impact in academic publishing.   |  |
| Optional/General comments   | <p>“A complete blood count was performed for all patients, and SGPT, SGOT, PT, and APTT levels were measured specifically in cases of severe dengue (DHF and DSS)”. the author mentioned this in the methodology section, while Table 7 presents these parameters for all types of dengue patients. This represents a contradiction. Furthermore, author mentioned in statistical analysis that “The statistical analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-17), with comparisons made using frequency, mean, median, SD, and appropriate statistical tests such as the odds ratio, independent t-test, and chi-square test for significance. A p-value of &lt;0.05 was considered statistically significant”. However, it appears that the author did not apply these types of analyses as described. The independent t-test and odds ratio (OR) seem to be missing in the results. It is unclear where these analyses were applied. Additionally, The author should review the highlighted points in the manuscript, as further comments have been added for consideration.</p> <p><b>Remarks:</b> The author needs to resolve the contradictions, especially regarding the parameters presented in Tables and the methodology described. Additionally, the statistical analyses, including the independent t-test and odds ratio, should be clearly applied and explained.</p> |  |

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:                            | Kaleem Maqsood   |
| Department, University & Country | Institute of zoology, University of the Punjab, Pakistan |