

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJPR_117646
Title of the Manuscript:	Expert perspectives on the prescription practice of paracetamol for managing pediatric febrile illness in Indian settings
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript can be a useful resource for evaluating and improving the management practices of pediatricians. The findings could help identify areas where pediatricians may need additional training or professional development opportunities to increase their knowledge and skills in specific domains. By highlighting any gaps or deficiencies in pediatricians' knowledge or practices, this research can inform the design of targeted educational sessions or other interventions to strengthen the capabilities of pediatricians and enhance their ability to provide high-quality care for their patients. 2. A shorter title can be more suitable: Expert perspectives on paracetamol for managing pediatric febrile illness. 3. The abstract provides a clear and comprehensive review of the study. However, I provide a few suggestions for potential improvement: The objective could be phrased more clearly "To examine expert perspectives on the prescription practices and clinical uses of paracetamol for managing pediatric febrile illness in routine Indian healthcare settings." Also, the abstract mixes the reporting of percentages with descriptive terms (such as "a significant proportion"). It's better to replace "a significant proportion" with the exact percentage to maintain consistency. 4. Yes, the structure is appropriate. 5. Yes, I guess the authors reported their work scientifically correct. 6. The references cited in the manuscript appear to be appropriate and up to date. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the English language used is appropriate and suitable. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Throughout the text, "pediatrician" should be substituted for "expert" and similar terms. 2. The introduction briefly mentions the incidence of febrile episodes in children but does not provide a picture of febrile illnesses in India. The introduction acknowledges the lack of research on "fever without a clear resource" in India but does not provide an overview of the existing literature on pediatric febrile illnesses in the country. 3. In the introduction section, it is better to mention some of the key points or recommendations from the mentioned guidelines. 4. In the methods, the section on participants mentions that an invitation was sent to "leading pediatricians in managing pediatric febrile illness," but it is not clear how these pediatricians were identified and selected. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>5. While the section on the questionnaire provides some details, it does not describe the specific content and structure of the FACT study questionnaire. - Details on the types of questions (e.g., multiple-choice, open-ended), the topics covered, and the rationale for the questionnaire design would strengthen this section.</p> <p>6. Regarding the questionnaire that was utilized, if it was designed by the authors, they should include all of the questions that were asked in the questionnaire. If the questionnaire was not designed by the authors, they should provide a reference or citation to the original source of the questionnaire, so that readers can access the full set of questions themselves.</p> <p>7. The definitions for low-grade fever and high-grade fever is better to be mentioned in the methods section.</p> <p>8. In the results section, the authors should clarify the total number of physicians that were sent the questionnaire, and then specify that 341 of them responded.</p> <p>9. Expand the discussion on the implications of the survey findings for clinical practice guidelines and decision-making. Highlight specific ways the insights could inform or update recommendations for fever assessment, antipyretic selection, dosing, and patient/caregiver education.</p> <p>10. Recommend specific areas for future research that could build upon the current survey, such as prospective observational studies, interventional trials, or qualitative investigations into caregiver perspectives and practices.</p> <p>11. For figures, it is preferable not to use abbreviations. However, if abbreviations are used, they should be clearly defined to explain what they stand for. In Figure 2, the abbreviation "SOS" is not clearly explained. Similarly, in Figure 3, the abbreviation "PCM" is not defined. To make the figures more understandable, it would be better to spell out the full terms instead of using abbreviations, or to provide a legend that defines any abbreviations used.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Sara Mostafavi
Department, University & Country	Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran