

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)
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, it has an account pertinent to the scientific community. 2. Yes, it is adequate. 3. Yes, it is adequate. 4. It is adequate in parts, I request the relocation of the keywords to the end of the abstract. 5. Yes I do; in parts, it is necessary to inform if the case study has been approved by the ethics committee, if not, it should be approved before publication. 6. Yes, they are. Inform if the case study has passed through the ethics committee. I have added some suggestions in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is adequate.	
Optional/General comments	Inform if the case study has passed through the ethics committee.	

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:	Rubens Barbosa Rezende
Department, University & Country	Federal University of São Paulo, Brazil