

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJTDH_83930
Title of the Manuscript:	Progress related in genetic research on Kawasaki disease
Type of the Article	Review

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Title: this is a review paper: reframe the title as "A review:----"• Abstract: there is repetition of sentences, more emphasis should be given to genes...there you are mentioning about treatment etc but in body of the article no such discussion is there...how it will improve in treatment. Should be written in crystal clear and easy language.• Key words: does not match with your title or abstract... these should be specific showing importance in your article• Introduction: needs revision ----add information regarding genes-----why are you writing this review-----what is the need-----how are genes related to treatment and better prognosis• Material & methods: no need to mention what you have written.....go as per the guidelines of journal regarding writing of a review.• Is there any need of writing results?• What do you mean by discussion and conclusion?• Write under subheadings as per the format of review article• Give the gist of genes in tabulated form---who identified/ when/ gene/chromosome number/ spps/ area/• How early identification of genes will help in treatment discuss that.• You have not discussed about treatment• Conclusion is completely wrong.....go through your review it needs many changes what are you trying to say inconclusion should be authentic References: do as per guidelines of journal	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Needs revision major mistakes are there	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Ruksana Majid Shah
Department, University & Country	SKUAST-Kashmir, India