

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_106338
Title of the Manuscript:	Hyaline membrane disease in premature infants: clinical, therapeutic and evolutionary aspects
Type of the Article	Review 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, it is important as a case report.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable. But this is not a review article. It is better to refer to the report or case study.</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, they are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, I think language quality of the article is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>While thanking the researcher(s) for their efforts, I think that the presented materials are not sufficient in the introduction and statement of the problem and there is a need to use references. In fact, some of the contents mentioned in the discussion section should be moved to the introduction section. It is also necessary to specify the main question of this research in the statement of the problem and then answer it in the conclusion section.</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:	Farzad Mirshamsi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran