

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_98648
Title of the Manuscript:	Mustard allergy in children and cross-reaction: Case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Comments for authors and editorial teams:: The study entitled "Mustard allergy in children and cross-reaction: Case report" has been written scientifically and interesting. However, some minor concerns should be considered to improve the novelty as well as the flow of the manuscript: 1- Abstract: Acceptable 2- Keywords: Should be edited to: <i>Mustard, Oral challenge test, Children, Mugwort syndrome, Anaphylaxis</i> 3- Introduction: Acceptable 4- Presentation of Case: Acceptable 5- Discussion & Conclusion: Could be scientifically than present. 6- Bibliography/References: Acceptable 7- I could not see running title, ethical code, funding support declaration and acknowledgment in manuscript. All of these compulsory. Final decision: Manuscript is acceptable for publication after minor correction</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I am not right reviewer for language/English quality of manuscript. Ask it from a native speaker reviewer.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Running title, ethical code, funding support declaration should be included.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kazemi A.
Department, University & Country	Tabriz University of Medical Science, Iran