

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_120823
Title of the Manuscript:	Gilles-de-la-Tourette Syndrome in Childhood: Molecular Aspects and Recent Research.
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Article review report</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>The abstract is concise and informative. The author has started the abstract with the example of animals that is not supposed to be included in the article where the subject of interest is human. The abstract section is lacking the techniques and methods used by the author. The purpose of the study is not clearly mentioned in the abstract. Key words are also missing.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction section provided sufficient background knowledge about the variable under discussion.</p> <p>Literature Review:</p> <p>The literature review is comprehensive and up-to-date.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>The results are not presented clearly and logically.</p> <p>The tables and figures aren't used effectively to present data.</p> <p>Discussion and Conclusion:</p> <p>The results are not clearly defined and conclusion section is missing.</p> <p>The discussion is not found to relate the findings to existing research.</p> <p>The limitations of the study are not addressed.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Wajiha Yasir</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Hazara University Mansehra, Pakistan</p>