

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2205
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute Dengue Myositis in a Pediatric Patient—An Uncommon Complication of a Common Disease: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, it is important to the scientific community, but some corrections are needed in the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think it's appropriate as a title.	
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 summary is not good and needs to be rewritten and reformulated.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	- The manuscript lacks a thorough review of the literature on dengue-related neuromuscular complications. While a few studies are cited, the discussion does not sufficiently contextualize the case within the broader research on dengue myositis. - There is a limited exploration of alternative diagnoses or complications that could have been considered, which weakens the case's diagnostic rigor. - The conclusion section reiterates points made earlier without providing new insights or recommendations for clinicians dealing with similar cases. The manuscript would benefit from a more robust discussion on the implications for clinical practice and the potential need for revised diagnostic protocols in areas endemic to dengue. - The lack of IgM testing, which is a confirmatory test for dengue, is acknowledged in the manuscript. However, this is a significant limitation, and the discussion surrounding this omission should be more in-depth, addressing the potential impact on the case's diagnostic accuracy. - Although case reports typically do not involve extensive statistical analysis, there is no mention of how the reported values (e.g., CPK levels) compare statistically with expected ranges in similar cases. Some basic statistical context could strengthen the report's findings and conclusions. - There is no mention of advanced diagnostic imaging (e.g., MRI) or histopathological confirmation (e.g., muscle biopsy) to support the diagnosis of myositis. This absence weakens the diagnostic robustness of the case report, as these methods could provide more definitive evidence of muscle involvement.	

Review Form2

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 uses some medical terms inconsistently or inaccurately. For instance, "raised creatinine phosphokinase" is used without consistently explaining its significance or how it correlates with the clinical findings. This inconsistency can cause confusion and reduce the manuscript's overall impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used in the manuscript are not sufficient and most of the references are old.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some sentences are poorly constructed, leading to ambiguity. For example, the abstract and discussion sections include run-on sentences that could be simplified for better clarity. There are grammatical errors throughout, such as "the power and tone of his leg muscles increased," which would be more accurately phrased as "the power and tone of his leg muscles improved."	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aqeel Ismael Ghani
Department, University & Country	Koya University, Iraq