

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81577
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case Report on Chikungunya with Diagnostic Evaluation & Management
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.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>Title: Authors should take note of the conjunction 'and' which was symbolically written.</p> <p>Abstract: (1) First sentence of abstract should begin from the third and should end with the second as presented by authors. (2) Authors should correct grammatical errors pointed out. (3) The number of keywords should be increased.</p> <p>Introduction: (1) Recast the starting sentence of first paragraph and condense paragraphs 1 and 2 into one paragraph. (2) In line 17, authors mentioned "Six Bangladeshi individuals with chikungunya fever are discussed in this briefcase series" report about findings are missing in 'DISCUSSION'</p> <p>Patient Information: (1) This should be preceded by a section titled 'Methods' should the work be a research article.</p> <p>The primary concern and symptoms of the patient: (1) Section redundant. (2) Remove.</p> <p>Medical family and psycho-social history: (1) Mention the unit of currency in line 2 or better still, remove sentence.</p> <p>Timeline: (1) Timeline of research or infection and disease development? (2) Authors should be as specific as possible in informing audience about the important course of encounter with their patient such as: the time of presentation of patient at your facility, days he has had such feelings, to time of treatment and recovery.</p> <p>Diagnostic challenges: (1) This should be condensed and put under the section for Diagnostic Assessment.</p> <p>Therapeutic investigation: (1) This should rather be recast to Therapeutic Intervention.</p> <p>Nursing Perspectives: (1) Recast lines 1-4 according to returning manuscript.</p> <p>Follow up and outcomes: (1) Bring this to be the last sentence in "Nursing Perspectives."</p> <p>Discussion: (1) Recast the penultimate sentence as in returning manuscript. (2) A table presenting the symptoms and other medical information regarding the various six individuals would be necessary here.</p> <p>Conclusion: (1) Treat the redundancy of this section and put forward, a more reasonable conclusion. (2) Also give in another section, their opinion for future prospects regarding the management of the disease.</p> <p>References: (1) Write the names of journals properly and correctly the ones pointed out in reference numbers 4, 10, 11, 5, 12 and 14 as Journal of Medical Case Reports, Journal of Neurovirology, Antiviral Research and Microbiology Spectrum respectively. (2) Recast reference number 13 as: Gamage SD, Kravolic SM, Roselle G. Emerging infectious diseases: concepts in preparing for and responding to the next microbial threat. In: K. L. Koenig and C. H. Schultz (eds). Disaster Medicine Comprehensive Principles and Practices. 2009: 75 - 102.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	(1) Authors should see the returning manuscript and follow the recommendations properly (2) Remove texts highlighted in red (3) Recast texts highlighted in yellow	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Peter Chikezie Ayogu
Department, University & Country	University of Minho, Portugal