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	1- Knowledge regarding virus structure, transmission, transportation and diagnosis of dengue virus is insufficient, please add some clear statements about these in introduction. **2-** Categorise types of dengue virus infection into Dengue fever, Dengue hemorraghic fever (DHF) and Dengue shock syndrome (DSS). **3-** Please remove grammatical mistakes.	**1. Comments addressed in Introduction** 2. Types of dengue categorized and explained in introduction. 3. The English language, grammar, terminology and punctuations were re-looked and corrected where ever deemed necessary.
Minor REVISION comments	1- Nurses play key role in management of dengue patients, please justify why nursing department was excluded? 2- Please also improve your discussion if possible. 3- Also split results and discussion sections to make it more presentable and clear.	1. Nursing students do not satisfy the inclusion criteria, thus excluded and explained 2. Discussion part was re-visited and some additions and corrections made 3. Discussion part separated from results and discussions
Optional/General comments	1- Conclusion should be clear and unblurred, please modify if required. 2- Some portions of results can also be presented in graphical form instead of tables.	1. Discussion part was re-visited 2. Retaining as tables

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)*	