

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_104192
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF INCREASED PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES IN ENHANCING THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF CHILDREN
Type of the Article	Not Mentioned

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscripts is doesn't show the type of study, the reader is unable to understand if it's a systemic review, letter to editor or a cross sectional study.</p> <p>The title doesn't mention the type of study</p> <p>No the abstract is unstructured and doesn't help the reader understand what the study wants to conclude. No the manuscripts has only introduction and conclusion, methodology, discussion is missing.</p> <p>No</p> <p>No comments</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Very poor english	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The Manuscripts seems to be copy pasted from various published literature and no scientific search into a research question has been done.	

### 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)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aritra Kumar Bose</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>