

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_95170</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Anthropometric Measures and IQ in Down Syndrome and Healthy Children: A Case Control Study</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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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> <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>The purpose of the research is one that is part of the medical paradigm of disability, naturally because it is medical research. However, this paradigm has long been surpassed in the study of disability and can bring potential problems in the interpretation and communication of results. Of course, medical research continues successfully and is fundamental in disability, but it must aim at significant progress in understanding and treating the somatic aspects involved in disability. Unfortunately, the current study does not bring any new knowledge, everything it proposes to study has long been studied, discovered and scientifically communicated. Therefore, in this context, comparing the cases of children with Down Syndrome with children with typical development from the point of view of anthropometric data and IQ, is not necessary, all the conclusions reached being known.</p> <p>The research is correct, but very simplistic, both in research design, purpose, statistical processing of the results and interpretation.</p> <p>The title of the article is suggestive for research, but even from the title we can realize the lack of relevance for the field of knowledge.</p> <p>The abstract is well structured, it provides all the necessary information for a succinct understanding of the research. Only the research gap is missing from the abstract, through which the authors should support the usefulness of the research and what novelty it brings.</p> <p>The introduction includes a brief presentation of the problem of Down's Syndrome, but at a level of popularization of science rather than a scientific approach. I recommend adding references to previous studies on this topic and their results.</p> <p>The patients' exclusion criteria should be argued and explained.</p> <p>All abbreviations should be explained the first time they appear in the text.</p> <p>The first three paragraphs of the discussions present only theoretical information, unrelated to the results. They should be moved to the introduction.</p> <p>The last three paragraphs of the discussions present in detail the conclusions of a research by other authors, it has no place here.</p> <p>The conclusion is very brief, it comes down to just one sentence. Should be further developed.</p> <p>There are no implications of the research and recommendations for medical or psycho-pedagogical practice. Please add.</p> <p>The bibliographic references are very few and none of them newer than 2016. Recent bibliographic references, from the last 5 years, should be added.</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><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>Anca Luștrea</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>West University of Timisoara, Romania</b>