

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_98869
Title of the Manuscript:	Client's Satisfaction with Child Health Care Delivery in Tamale Teaching Hospital
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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>The research is original for the relevance of the analysed topic. The contribution is logical in its articulation. The problematizing style of the reflections is interesting. The methodology is clear and correctly applied to the research design carried out.</p> <p>The title of the article is appropriate to the topic covered.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive and exhaustive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are more appropriate.</p> <p>I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The research is original for the relevance of the analysed topic. The contribution is logical in its articulation. The problematizing style of the reflections is interesting. The methodology is clear and correctly applied to the research design carried out.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rosella Tomassoni
Department, University & Country	University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, Italy