

Review of: "[Research Note] Dengue – Therapeutic Efforts in Mexico"

Christopher Maucourant¹

¹ Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris VI)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I am not sure about what type of communication is this. If it is a note their might be too much concepts described without being discussed in a so small text. Article/review should be formatted with an abstract/introduction/materials and methods and a discussion. The authors should provide in the abstract and the introduction what is the message they want to bring to the scientific community. In the first part authors assess about Dengue epidemic in Mexico but do not provide references for this. Then, authors come with results from "sterile mosquito method and Wolbachia" but do not explain what are those methods, do not discuss the results and do not explain which results come from each of the techniques. Then the authors go to something else with no links in between about drugs against NS3/4 proteins coming from an "objective" analysis from CINVESTAV researchers. What is CINVESTAV? At what point is this "objective"? Maybe a table with molecules, target, efficiency and references would help to follow and to structure the paper. Among those drugs authors speak about Metformin and Ezetimib but do not provide what are those molecules and how they are working. Authors make link between cholesterol, viral replication and Ezetimib but do not provide proof that ezetimib plays the role they argued and do not discuss it. Then authors conclude by all these results show that ezetimib is an excellent drug to inhibit dengue infection with no other clues than the ones previously highlighted. Finally authors "consider it is time to carry them out in vivo in search of therapeutic options to control dengue". If the authors think that what is presented in the note is enough to start an in vivo essay, I encourage them to try it so then they can get data and show them. For now, as it is, I don't understand what is the aim of what the authors wrote. If they really want those drugs to be tested, they should go much more deeper in their analysis and provide for each drug a meta analysis of each paper using them.