

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81038
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimating the diagnostic accuracy of High Sensitive C- Reactive Protein (hs-CRP) in early detection of neonatal sepsis
Type of the Article	Study protocol

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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

[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><u>Methodology.</u></p> <p>1) Inclusion and exclusion criteria of control group are not well explained. The condition of the control should be specified. The authors need to add more inclusion and exclusion in this study. Suggested as follow:</p> <p>Inclusion criteria: (based on Integrated Management of Neonatal and Childhood Illness (IMNCI) guidelines) –</p> <p>a) convulsions or, b. fast breathing (60 breaths per minute or more) or, c. severe chest indrawing or nasal flaring or grunting or, d. bulging fontanelle or, e. 10 or more skin pustules or big boil or, axillary temperature 37.5 0 C or above, or less than 35.50 C or, g. lethargic or unconscious or, h. less than normal movements.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria</p> <p>a. Neonates less than 28 weeks. b. Neonates with weight less than 1000 grams. c. Neonates with suspected TORCH group of Infection / viral and fungal infections at admission.</p> <p>2.) Is the study obtained appropriate informed consent? If yes, please mention ethical approval number, from where?</p> <p>3.) Is the sample size appropriate and justified? Authors need to perform power analysis as part of study design.</p> <p>Biochemical analysis</p> <p>1.) How much venous blood will be collected? Which tube? 2.) Please add on preparation of sample before analysis such as centrifugation and storage, 3.) What is the analyser machine will be used to analyser the sample? Which method (immunoassay / ELISA/ Nephelometry) 4.) The principal of test of hs CRP was not described.</p>	<p>Correction effected</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Done revision</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This is an interesting cross-sectional study aim to estimating the diagnostic accuracy of High Sensitive C- Reactive Protein (hs-CRP) in early detection of neonatal sepsis</p> <p>.</p> <p>In general, the sentences were fair, however there are many spelling and grammatical errors.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>I strongly suggest this paper to be sent for proofreading service to minimize grammar errors. All factual statements correct however not adequately supported by recent citations.</p> <p>Abstract Methodology is not precisely explained.</p> <p>References: Please follow the journal format</p> <p>Introduction. 1) The role of High Sensitive C- Reactive Protein (hs-CRP) in early detection of neonatal sepsis is not well highlighted and author not focusing on 'why' the research is important and how the study will have impact in the community. 2.) The research gap is not well explained - maybe some minor revising needed to enhance the research gap and highlight the importance of the study. 3.) Consider to add more literature review regarding previous serum markers used to screen sepsis, and the disadvantages or issues of these biomarkers . Maybe can highlight the benefits of current markers that have been used in this study.</p> <p>Objectives 1) Change to general objectives and specific objectives 2) Consider to change • To “determine” cut off values for hsCRP in detecting neonatal sepsis • To “determine and compare” the cost-effective analysis of CRP vs hs CRP in neonatal septic screen</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p><u>Result & Discussion.</u></p> <p>Since the study is not started yet, I cannot comment on result and discussion, These are my suggestion.</p> <p>1.Results: Need to in line and answer the study objectives</p> <p>2.Discussion:</p> <p>Author should focus on interpretations of the findings and comparison with previous studies in this topic. Limitation and strength of the study should be explained. - Consider adding point how the study's result influence future research.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	