

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_119374
Title of the Manuscript:	Low-Grade Gliomas in Children
Type of the Article	Letter to the editor

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic is fine and important for scientific community</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The type of manuscript is letter to editor so there is no abstract</p> <p>The article would convey better if separate subheadings are there for etiopathogenesis, morphology, clinical features and treatment and rehabilitation etc.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1.The references are so many (60 in total) that a review article instead of letter to the editor should have been submitted (just a suggestion on a lighter note)</p> <p>2.Despite so many references, a large chunk of the manuscript has been written without mentioning particular references.</p> <p>3.The references do not appear at all in chronological order and are haphazardly numbered in the text.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article needs to be revised so that redundancy and repetition in text is avoided. It should be more clear, crisp and concise.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shweta
Department, University & Country	Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee Government Medical College, India