

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_95575
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Optimizing Critical Care Resources in Pediatric Surgery Patients
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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is a vital topic to the scientific community as it describes the management of available hospital resources by implementing the prediction scores to admitted patients. The title is suitable for the article. The abstract (432 words) needs to be summarized more with the definition of abbreviations. The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically correct and essential. The references are sufficient and recent. <p>I found the paper well written, and the topic is relevant to the journal reader. However, some comments should be considered to improve the quality of the article: Grammatical errors. English proofreading is highly suggested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In summary(conclusion part), the sentence (PEWS score was highly significant as to predict PICU Admission postop) also (ASA, PEWs, and pSOFA were predictors for LOS for more than 21 days, predictors of mortality and predictors for PICU admission Postop) are repeated, I advise rewriting the conclusion. The introduction needs to be extended to show the components of the different prediction scores and how to interpret and implement these scores into clinical practice. In the methods: more details are needed on how the classification of the low-risk, an intermediate and high-risk group was made (no definition of the criteria of the scoring systems). References should be revised and aligned to the correct author (e.g., references 21,22,23,24,25,26 were not correlated to the correct authors) Abbreviations of some terms like (CHD, GCS, DM, and MABP) should be defined for the reader or be in the appendix 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ebtihal Elameen Eltyeb
Department, University & Country	Jazan University, Saudi Arabia