



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_67515
Title of the Manuscript:	Unusual neurological manifestation of dengue fever
Type of the Article	Case Report

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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>1 - It is mandatory that the authors revise the text in English. There are language problems that at times make the reading difficult to follow.</p> <p>2 - The study would be significantly strengthened if more information could be provided in a table for variables relevant to the endpoints measured in the study such as: proteins, glucose, adenosine deaminase levels present in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) examination and also the number of cells/mm³ observed in the sample including the references values of the sets used in the dosages. Likewise, you also make a table or describe the hemogram results (e.g. platelet and leukocytes counts).</p> <p>3 - Which day after the patient admission at the hospital or on the onset of the symptoms was done the CSF study? This data is important for the debate. In addition, the data about neutrophil count in the CSF sample must be explained in the discussion.</p> <p>4 - In addition, the study would be strengthened if the authors include information on case presentation about the year of admission of the patient, in which hospital the patient was attended and from which country the patient belongs to?</p> <p>5 - The authors declared in the text that “ the magnetic resonance imaging of the brain was suggestive of hypodense area in bilateral basal ganglia (double donut sign) without any evidence of demyelination and spine was found to be normal”. But Acute Disseminated Encephalomyelitis (ADEM), as shown in figure 1, is an acute disseminated encephalomyelitis and is characterized by an acute inflammatory demyelination ailment. How do you explain this result?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1 - Authors must correct some inconsistencies contained in the writing of the case report as follows:</p> <p>a) In the abstract, it was informed that the patient was admitted with a fever of 4 days duration and in the case presentation, it is reported as 5 days of fever duration. Which day is it correct?</p> <p>b) There are two pieces of information, one is in the abstract that says that the patient did not have neck stiffness. And the other, is in the description of the case report, which says that the patient had neck stiffness. Please review this information and make the corrections.</p> <p>2 - There are abbreviations without translation throughout the manuscript: ADEM, CSF, NCV, and PCR. Include them in the list of abbreviations and make the description in the text as well.</p> <p>3 - Was the presence of IgG anti-dengue virus evaluated in the blood sample? It is important to know if the patient had already been infected by another dengue serotype, since it is known that dengue provides the phenomenon of intrinsic antibody-dependent infection enhancement (ADE).</p> <p>4 - It was informed that the patient received human immunoglobulins therapy during 5 days. What was the dose of antibody therapy used for patient treatment? It should be indicated in the text.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The topic is interesting, but needs to include more information about the patient, clinical and laboratory results.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Irmtraut Araci Hoffmann Pfrimer</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Goiás, Brazil</i>