

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_102549
Title of the Manuscript:	A cohort study and an audit project on vitamin D prescribing practices for children in pediatric clinics at a tertiary hospital in Jordan
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6.</p> <p>7. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is appropriate for scientific community as issues relating to wellness of new-borns and children are critical as we work towards alleviating morbidity and mortality of such a target group</p> <p>The title looks ok however it may benefit from rephrasing to make it scientific in expression eg "Vitamin D prescribing practices for children in paediatric clinics at a tertiary hospital in Jordan: a Prospective Study". The audit bit may not be necessary as it is obvious that it will be catered during the whole process of the study.</p> <p>The abstract layout look fine, however there is need to state under methodology how the participants were selected and their allocation ratio.</p> <p>The manuscript layout looks scientific, however the literature review section need improvement on the tables as well as in Chapter 4, author to adhere to correct labelling of tables.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references looks ok, however author is advised to follow the format recommended by the journal in question.</p> <p>In as much as both the exposure and outcome have already occurred at the outset of the study, the retrospective cohort study is more susceptible to the effects of bias and in this context, the authors need to explain in details how the participants were selected, the difference in exposure between the two arms of participants, the allocation ratio between the two arms and how the authors managed confounders and bias. Author needs to revisit the result section and state the cardinal result analysis for a prospective cohort study. Such measurements like relative risk ratio, P value, confidence interval should come out in the result section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English is scientific	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Nil	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gladys Mugdza
Department, University & Country	University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe