

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPR_103455</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of human parainfluenza virus infection in children of Xianyang Children's Hospital in 2022</b>
Type of the 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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>		
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the article titled "Investigation of the Epidemiological and Clinical Features of Human Parainfluenza Virus (HPIV) in Children" provides valuable insights into the prevalence, clinical characteristics, and seasonal distribution of HPIV infections in children. However, there are areas where the article can be improved to enhance its clarity and scientific rigor. Here are some suggestions for improvement:</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> The abstract should provide a clear and concise summary of the study objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. It would be helpful to revise the abstract to provide a more focused and informative summary of the research.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The introduction should provide a more comprehensive review of the existing literature on HPIV infections in children. It would be beneficial to provide a more detailed overview of the clinical significance and impact of HPIV infections. This will help readers understand the broader context of your study.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b> It is important to provide a clear and transparent description of how the study was conducted to ensure the reproducibility of the results.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> The presentation of results could be improved by using subheadings and tables to enhance readability and clarity. Additionally, it would be helpful to provide statistical measures of significance when discussing differences between groups or seasons.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> It is important to compare your findings with existing literature and discuss their implications in the broader context of HPIV research. Additionally, you can discuss the limitations of your study and suggest areas for further research.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	Conclusion: The conclusion section is brief and does not adequately summarize the key points of the study. Revise the conclusion to provide a clear and concise summary of your research findings.	
--	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Larisa Anghel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>"Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania</b>