

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96123
Title of the Manuscript:	Sotos Syndrome Type 1 and Type 2: Case Series of 4 Pediatric Patients with Variants in NSD1 and NFIX Genes
Type of the Article	Clinical Practice 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, the manuscript has addressed a genetic disease, Sotos Syndrome which needs to gain attention among the society. The authors are appreciated for showing interest in presenting the case study of a rare genetic disease 2. Yes, the title is appropriate but the gene name needs to be italicized 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive 4. The structure of the manuscript needs to be altered since it has sub-headings and tables in the discussion which can be moved to the results 5. Since, it is a case study the discussion must be strong to be compared with the earlier studies which will add to the scientific merit of the article 6. Reference should be properly arranged and standard reference can be included instead of internet sources	
Minor REVISION comment 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The language of the manuscript is good	
Optional/General comments	The article will be more interesting after considering the comments given above and as well as in the manuscript	

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:	M. Kaviya
Department, University & Country	Bharathiar University, India