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|  | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript provides a comprehensive and detailed explanation of shock and its types. Subtopics are very well explained and contain valuable information for clinicians, students, and paraclinical staff. This chapter describes the types, pathophysiology, and treatment in a sequential and detailed manner, along with diagrammatic representation. Flow charts and diagrams make a reader remember more easily to reproduce. Furthermore, the manuscript provides evidence-based practice depending on various standard references.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Title suits the article. But in case you need an alternative title you can – Understanding Shock:- a comprehensive guide to Diagnosis and treatment** |  |
| 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. | **Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and provides all the important information about shock and its types. It also provides a systemic approach to subtypes of shock its diagnosis and management. The term vasoplegia needs to be introduced in this article to understand more about septic shock. Emerging biomarkers like procalcitonin, lactate and choice of fluid for resuscitation should be explained in more detailed manner.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | **Based on review of the topic it appears scientifically correct as it involves detailed knowledge of shock. It appears that the author has taken most of the referneces and text from standard text books like *Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine* and *Robbins Basic Pathology*.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **Yes, the references are sufficient, but the references in link form will not work in print format. Actual text formats should be provided. Some of the references are too old e.g first reference – Sethi AK, Sharma P , Mohta M, Tyagi** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the manuscript are clear and appropriate for the target audience. Lanuage is straightforward and simple making complex topics easier to understand. The use of Medical terms is appropriate and logically organised. However, there are areas where improvements can enhance precision. Some sentences are long and could benefit for better reading like- Management mainly includes the identification of early signs and symptoms of shock, which can be written as Management focuses on identifying the early signs and symptoms of shock. Conversational phrasing used – Meanwhile look for the underlying cause of shock.  Also, some sentences need to be rephrased eg - There will be the absence of blood pressure despite aggressive resuscitative efforts, with the absence of spontaneous respirations. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Overall the manuscript is a perfect guide for diagnosis and management of shock. Will need some refinements in terminology consistency, updates based on latest evidence like molecular diagnostics and markers might improve the depth of management. Considering, the time limit, I would suggest some additions that might help the reader to understand shock. |  |
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