

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_99397
Title of the Manuscript:	Breastmilk Jaundice – Could it be more common than we realize?
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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, but this is an established common case; some units usually have 2 or 4 cases per month.</p> <p>nice, but it's better to mention the type of study, like a case series, a literature review, etc.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Doi , Better to remove or put for all</p> <p>Keywords are better in MeSH terms and in alphabetical order, and they should not be in the title.</p> <p>Jaundice units are better added to mg/dl as well.</p> <p>It is better to mention consanguineous marriage, a thyroid test, and a genetic test for Crigler-Najjar syndrome, Gilberts, etc.</p> <p>Mention family history.</p> <p>In discussion, it is better to mention breast-feeding jaundice (a lean baby) vs. breast milk jaundice (a big baby).</p> <p>Breastmilk jaundice is a diagnosis of exclusion; it is better to do more investigations.</p> <p>When is there a TSB? HB is required to know if it is due to lysis or an excess of HB.</p> <p>HEMOLYSIS, inlace of "HEMATOPOISIS" (discussion, 3rd para)</p> <p>If the fever is not there, the baby is active. There is no need to rule out sepsis or malaria.</p> <p>It's better to make a table for all three cases.</p> <p>A simple case presentation is more accurate and in good order. For example, in 2.2's case presentation: Is the baby term How many weeks? Is it an iugur to be needed?</p> <p>It's better to mention uniqueness, like nobody reported it in that area. first reported case from our unit, etc. Better to add an image</p> <p>It's better to mention consent.</p> <p>overall good report</p>	
---	--	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments	Yes minor spelling punctuation are there otherwise fine	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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