

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_99716
Title of the Manuscript:	25-hydroxyvitamin D Level in Autism Spectrum Disorders and the Efficacy of Vitamin D Supplementation in Saudi Autistic Children
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The topic of the manuscript is important for scientific community. However, the low number of investigated subjects and conclusions do not bring nothing significantly important. The title of the article is suitable and promising. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically correct, however, the number of investigated subjects (9) is low and the time for investigation of vitamin D is insufficient. The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I am not qualified to evaluate the language quality but I understand well.	
Optional/General comments	The article does not bring any sufficient conclusions.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Strunecka
Department, University & Country	Charles University, Czechia