

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPR_96734</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nursing knowledge, attitudes and practices related to blood transfusion at the neonatal and pediatric intensive care unit at university hospital Mohammed VI Marrakech Morocco.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
--	---------------------------	--

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>Better to add type of study</p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p>The topic was good but needed corrections.</p> <p>In MeSH terms and alphabetical order, key words are more effective.</p> <p>It is preferable to write abstracts in a structured manner.</p> <p>It is preferable to include a reference number in the manuscript.</p> <p>Is it better to specify which statistical test was used to scale the 30 questions? Mention them, and even better, mention who prepared them.</p> <p>Only some questions are discussed in the manuscript.</p> <p>It is preferable to rewrite the discussion and results as per journal guidelines.</p> <p>Clarity in the abstract and introduction is preferable.</p> <p>Any tables and statistical methods would be better to add.</p> <p>References are not in good format.</p> <p>Sample size better to calculate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>No</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rakesh Kotha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Osmania University, India</b>