

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Pediatric Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJPR_97547 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | THIAMINE DEFICIENCY IN EXCLUSIVE BREASTFED INFANTS WITH ENCEPHALOPATHY ATTENDING GB PANTH CHILDREN HOSPITAL SRINAGAR. |
| 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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Required REVIEW Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT IS A RESEARCH ON CHILDREN'S HEALTH. I BELIEVE THAT THIS ARTICLE IS IMPORTANT FOR THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND SHOULD BE READJUSTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES FOR POSSIBLE PUBLICATION, BECAUSE IT WAS TYPED IN TWO COLUMNS. 2. Is the title of the article adequate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) R/ THE TITLE IS ADEQUATE, ONLY THE MEANING OF THE ABBREVIATION GB SHOULD BE EXPLAINED. 3. Is the article summary comprehensive? R/ THE ABSTRACT IS ADEQUATE, IT COMPLIES WITH THE INDICATIONS OF THE JOURNAL EXCEPT FOR THE TYPING WHERE IT WAS DONE IN TWO COLUMNS, THEREFORE MUST READJUST THE GUIDELINES OF THE JOURNAL. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? R/ THE MANUSCRIPT WAS WRITTEN WITHOUT USING THE SUBSECTIONS AS SUGGESTED IN THE JOURNAL, BUT IT FOLLOWS A LOGICAL ORDER IN ITS WRITING. THE INTRODUCTION IS ADEQUATE, ALTHOUGH BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES ARE TYPED WRONG. THE TOPIC MATERIALS AND METHODS SHOULD BE REFORMULATED, TO COMPLETE THE INFORMATION, WHICH IS MISSING. APPLIANCES USED, BRAND, MODEL, ETC. ; PERFORMED ANALYSIS METHODS; WORK PLACE, DEPARTMENT, CITY, STATE, COUNTRY. ADEQUATE RESULTS, ADEQUATE DISCUSSION, ADEQUATE CONCLUSIONS. OUTDATED BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES, SOMETHING OLD. 26 CITES AND THE MOST RECENT IS 6 YEARS OF PUBLICATION (13 REFERENCES GO FROM 2010 TO 2016). THE REST IS BEFORE, 1985 UNTIL 2010) 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R/ THE MANUSCRIPT PRESENTS AN IMPORTANT THEME. MUST BE REVISED AND ADJUSTED TO THE JOURNAL'S RULES 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them on the review form. R/ AS SAID BEFORE, THIS ITEM PROVIDES ERRORS ACCORDING TO THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. MUST BE RECTIFIED. THE LISTING REFERENCE 19 DOES NOT HAVE PUBLICATION YEAR, VOLUME, No. PAGES, ETC. OUTDATED REFERENCES. (In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) <p>R/ THIS ARTICLE IS IMPORTANT FOR THE COMMUNITY THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE RESEARCH. AUTHORS MUST REVIEW WHAT THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES ARE AND ADJUST ALL THE WORK CARRIED OUT WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. THIS WAY WE CAN OBTAIN A PUBLISHABLE ARTICLE.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the language/English quality of the article adequate for scholarly communications? R/ ENGLISH LANGUAGE QUALITY IS ADEQUATE. | |
| <p>Optional/General commen</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: | Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez |
| Department, University & Country | Havana University, Cuba |