

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_100246
Title of the Manuscript:	“Clinical and epidemiological characteristics of new-onset Diabetes Mellitus Type 1 during the COVID -19 pandemic in a third level center, Lima -Peru”
Type of the 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.journalajrre.com/index.php/AJRRE/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>1- This manuscript has some importance to the medical community as it describes clinical and epidemiological characteristics for COVID-19 paediatric patients with new onset type 1 diabetes mellitus in Peru. Unfortunately, the authors failed to conclude any association analysis based on data collected.</p> <p>2- The title of article looks suitable but I recommend changing “a third level center” with “the National Institute of Child Health”.</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract is comprehensive but it provides many details especially in results section which may be confusing to the reader.</p> <p>4- The structure of this manuscript looks appropriate.</p> <p>5- Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct but the data are presented in a confusing way to the reader. Many numbers and parameters were presented in tables without ability to make association analysis.</p> <p>6- Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>7- In table 2, I don't know why authors used median and range to describe categorical variables like gender.</p> <p>8- I would recommend to rewrite the manuscript in a more professional method and in a more concise style.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Authors should pay more attention to mistakes in grammar and punctuations.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq