

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_98142
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Pattern of Paediatric Endocrine Disorders in Rivers State University Teaching Hospital- a pilot study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrre.com/index.php/AJRRE/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)

Review Form 1.7

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Prevalence and Pattern of Paediatric Endocrine Disorders in Rivers State University Teaching Hospital a cross sectional study</p> <p>Yes yes Yes</p> <p>Doi is available for only some references and should be removed or added for all.</p> <p>1. Key words are better off in alphabetical order in mesh terms; it is better to remove the words that are in the title. 2. Duration is better to mention in years. 3. Sample size justification is needed. 4. if possible put Ethical committee number 5. If possible, compare the numerical data with other studies; in some places, it is lacking.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Fine but some typo errors are there better to correct</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>What is the cause of death in these two cases?</p> <p>If any p values are better to mention, though, the tables are good enough.</p>	

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:	Rakesh Kotha
Department, University & Country	Niloufer Hospital, India