

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_98158
Title of the Manuscript:	An Unusual Case Presentation of Wheeze
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.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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Yes , is a important case of study	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	No is not suitable case report medical study of atypical respiratory distress of 6 years old	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No an abstract has to be like a little resume of all the article, where you can present a little introduction , resume of methodology of study results and a tiny conclusion	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	In the case of study you should presented with the protocol of study as the medical and scientist guidelines recommended	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	First it should be presented the personal id of the patient age, gender, place of birth, main background, initiate the presentation of the case with de oldest signs and symptoms till the current day treatment and studies with interpretation without abreviatures , then conclusion of the studies , diagnosis and the final protocol of treatment	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The introduction it should be more consistent in the disease or case that we are studying there s not enough references	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	yes	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Ana Rivera Soto
Department, University & Country	UNAM, Mexico