SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRID_56003**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Knowledge towards Prevention and Management of Dengue: A Cross-Sectional study among Dental, Medical and Pharmacy Students in a Private University, Malaysia.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	The English needs improvements. I provided some suggestions in the text. In addition I urge the authors to be consistent with the use of terms. The order of the introduction was scattered. Further please distinguish -the pathogen (dengue virus) , -the infection with the pathogen (infection with dengue virus or dengue virus infection. - the disease (dengue or dengue fever or severe dengue)	The English language, grammar, terminology and punctuations were re-looked and corrected where ever deemed necessary.
Optional/General comments	I would have liked it if the " direction" of the right answer of the questions would be randomized. Meaning that there were various versions of the questionnaires with the similar topics questioned but that the correct answer to the question could be either yes in the one and in the other with no. In this way the bias to the right answer could be eliminated or at least randomized.	There were a couple of negative questions placed randomly which are mentioned in table 2 with * and foot notes

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)*	Corrections made and high lighted in the manuscript.