

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	STORY OF SEPSIS
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4052
Title of the Manuscript:	STORY OF SEPSIS
Type of the Article	Complete Book

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is a valuable contribution to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive understanding of sepsis, a critical medical condition affecting millions globally. It encapsulates the historical evolution, pathophysiology, clinical trials, and treatment protocols, offering insights for researchers, clinicians, and medical educators. By addressing sepsis in a structured yet accessible manner, the manuscript promotes awareness, improves clinical approaches, and aids in the development of effective strategies to reduce mortality and enhance patient care.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is	
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 of the article is comprehensive, covering key aspects like the prevalence of sepsis, its burden, and the manuscript's objectives. However, adding specific highlights of the chapters, such as advancements in diagnostic tools, landmark trials, and future prospects, could enhance its appeal. Simplifying certain technical terms for broader accessibility may also be beneficial.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically accurate, as it is well-referenced with credible sources and thoroughly explains key concepts like the history, pathophysiology, and treatment of sepsis. The detailed inclusion of clinical trials and biomarkers demonstrates its scientific rigor. Minor improvements in clarity and conciseness could further enhance its presentation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient and include credible sources, but some are older. Adding more recent studies, especially those published in the last 5 years on sepsis biomarkers, treatment advancements, and clinical trials, could strengthen the manuscript. For example, recent updates on the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines could be beneficial.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise terminology. However, minor revisions to improve sentence structure and eliminate redundancy could enhance readability and professionalism.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is a well-structured and insightful resource for understanding sepsis, addressing both historical and modern perspectives. Its comprehensive approach makes it valuable for medical professionals and researchers. Adding recent advancements and streamlining certain sections for clarity would further elevate its impact. Additionally, graphical summaries or illustrations could make the content more engaging and accessible.	

[Review Form3](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sharoon Mirza
Department, University & Country	Khyber Medical University, Pakistan