

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_118478
Title of the Manuscript:	Changes in pattern of childhood admissions and outcome before and during the COVID pandemic in an emergency unit in Sokoto, Nigeria: A three-year review (2019-2021)
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>)

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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important and is publishable.</p> <p>2. Current readers expect short and sweet title. In this sense the title of this manuscript looks long.</p> <p>3. Yes, it reflects the overall content of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Some of the sub-headings follow too general texts such as data entry and analysis section says which software has been used for data entry and analysis. This in fact is not necessary if the author can present the data analysis and interpretation techniques.</p> <p>5. Some more critical review is needed to make it scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The author should ensure that only the references cited in the text are listed under reference section. The references used for this manuscript should be able to present a coherent way to theorise the issue of the debate to come to the construct.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. A thorough editing is needed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Padma Prasad Khatiwada
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal