

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_102432
Title of the Manuscript:	Umbilical Cord Blood Hemoglobin as a Predictor of Significant Neonatal Hyperbilirubinemia in Term Newborns
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.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)
<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. 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>Yes , assuming the study was conducted well based on scientific methodologies, would have yielded more robust and scientifically defensible results. The manuscript lack scientific quality and also lack adequate and updated literature for comparison.</p> <p>No . Predictors of Umbilical Cord Blood Hemoglobin among Neonatal Hyperbilirubinemia in Term Newborns at -----mention the study settings</p> <p>Nil --how respondents were selected was not shown, statistical analysis was inappropriate and also, there is no results of the study hence could not derived logical conclusion</p> <p>Fair</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article lack comprehensive literature to allow comparison from previous studies. Also, data analysis was inappropriate for the study to derive logical conclusion</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adamu Dalhatu
Department, University & Country	Bayero University Kano, Nigeria