

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2652
Title of the Manuscript:	Mpox (Monkeypox): The Current State of the Global Health Crisis
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive overview of the Mpox virus and its transmission, symptoms, and treatment options. The detailed comparison with similar viral infections like smallpox and chickenpox is particularly valuable for healthcare professionals in accurate diagnosis and treatment. The discussion on long-term complications and psychological impacts highlights the need for ongoing research and public health strategies. The manuscript effectively bridges gaps in current knowledge and emphasizes the importance of vigilant diagnosis and management of Mpox, especially in light of its increasing prevalence.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. However, if a more specific title is needed. I would suggest something like: "A Comprehensive Review of Mpox: Clinical Presentation, Diagnosis, and Management in Comparison with Smallpox and Chickenpox."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is clear and provides a good summary of the manuscript. To make it even stronger, I suggest adding a sentence highlighting the importance of telling Mpox apart from other viral infections like smallpox and chickenpox for accurate diagnosis. Also, mentioning the possible long-term effects and the need for more research would make the abstract more relevant and informative.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are well-organized.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It provides a thorough review of Mpox, covering various aspects such as symptoms, diagnosis, complications, and treatment. The manuscript is well-supported by current research and references, making it a valuable resource for the scientific community. The detailed comparison with other viral infections like smallpox and chickenpox enhances its accuracy and relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The authors should clearly emphasize the contribution of the study. Please note that the up-to-date of references will contribute to the up-to-date of your manuscript. The studies named- "Enhancing Monkeypox Diagnostics: Exploring the Potential of EfficientNet and Big Transfer"- can be used to explain the methodology in the study or to indicate the contribution in the "Introduction" section.	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication though there are a few instances where the language could be simplified for better readability. Minor grammatical and stylistic improvements could also enhance the overall clarity of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the manuscript is comprehensive and well-researched. Minor revisions in language and the addition of recent references could make it even stronger.	

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:	Sharia Arfin Tanim
Department, University & Country	American International University, Bangladesh