



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_46827
Title of the Manuscript:	The Epidemiology of Dengue fever with Special Reference to Malaysia - emphasizing Prevention and Control
Type of the Article	Review Paper

**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>)



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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The Epidemiology of Dengue fever with Special Reference to Malaysia - emphasizing Prevention and Control</b></p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The subject is interesting and important. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p><b>-General comments:</b> The text should be divided in the usual sections of Introduction, Material and Methods, and Results and Discussion.</p> <p><b>-Literature review (Material and Methods):</b> Two different types of literature review research are available: systematic review and non-systematic review or narrative review (update). Author should comment in more depth on the weaknesses of the chosen method. The traditional method of integration in the literature has been the narrative review, but it has two basic weaknesses. First, there is no rule on how to obtain primary data and how to integrate results; that is the subjective criterion of the reviewer. Second, the narrative reviewer does not synthesize quantitatively the data found in the different publications; therefore, these revisions are very susceptible to inaccuracies and biases.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies, which should be provided a picture, albeit limited, of the state of knowledge and the main questions on the subject that these studies clarify and left unclear (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, characteristics of the persons studied, etc.).</p> <p><b>-References:</b> Review, please, the rules of the Journal (for example, the reference 21, 22, 30, etc.).</p> <p><b>-Keywords:</b> For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in <a href="https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search">https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search</a>)</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Jose Luis Turabian</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Health Center Santa Maria de Benquerencia, Regional Health Service of Castilla la Mancha (SESCAM), Spain</i></b>