

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_115342
Title of the Manuscript:	"Hurried child syndrome: A review"
Type of the Article	Review Article

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> "Hurried Child Syndrome: A Review" has the potential to contribute significantly to the scientific community by increasing awareness, informing practice, guiding research, and serving as an educational resource on this important societal issue. The title is appropriate, it would benefit from being descriptive, direct, accurate, interesting, concise, precise, unique, and non-misleading, rather than solely focusing on key terms. While the abstract is clear, it should include the study's objectives, methodology, and the resulting contributions to enhance comprehension. Structure needs to be improved. The article lacks the depth expected of a review article, with insufficient scientific studies and references to support its claims. It appears too generalized rather than offering a critical analysis. Conducting a deeper analysis would elevate the paper to meet standard expectations and contribute meaningfully to the scientific community. Insufficient references but 5 mentioned references are 2022, 2013, 2021. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Nope	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	I appreciate the authors for their thoughtful selection and valuable contribution. However, I recommend delving deeper into the subject matter to enhance its accessibility for fellow researchers. While the effort is commendable, for scientific research articles, adherence to a standardized manuscript format, including a clear methodology for review articles, is essential. The language in the article needs improvement; too many conjunctions in one sentence results in wordiness. I suggest focusing on critical improvements and enhancing effectiveness to elevate the quality of the article.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cynthiya Rose J S
Department, University & Country	Vellore Institute of Technology, India