

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_95885
Title of the Manuscript:	Mimicry Of Two Disease Guillian-Barre Syndrome And Japanese Encephalitis: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This manuscript contains important information for the scientific community, but has been widely published. Maybe the author can highlight the novelty or unique things from this manuscript.</li><li>2. The title is suitable.</li><li>3. No. Abstract must be written in a structured with an introduction, case presentation, discussion and conclusion. It will help the author to make a comprehensive abstract for readers.</li><li>4. Yes.</li><li>5. Yes.</li><li>6. Most journals are way too old, it's best to use journal as references from the past 10 years.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agung Riyanto Budi Santoso
Department, University & Country	Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia