

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	_ The background accurately represents current knowledge in this field. <input type="checkbox"/> _ The author does explain why they conducted the study. <input type="checkbox"/> _ The research questions are straightforward. <input type="checkbox"/> _ The study design is appropriate. <input type="checkbox"/> _ The methods are described in enough detail, and nothing is confusing. <input type="checkbox"/> _ Tables Clinical features found in patients with Sotos syndrome are completed. <input type="checkbox"/> _ The results are reasonable, the data support the interpretation, and no fatal flaws were detected.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fix language errors Formatting required as per journal guidelines	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nguyen Thi Trieu
Department, University & Country	Vietnam