

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPR_123314</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Chronic Pain in a Pediatric Patient: Case Report and Literature Review of chronic pain management and osteomyelitis</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	After corrections can be published.	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	IT is well documented case report with so many patient findings. History of patient's status and diagnosing process is well explained. Epidemiology, diagnosing, treatment and prognosis are presented and can be useful in clinical practice. Presentation of scintigraphy with labelled leukocytes is missing. There is no scientific importance of this article. Renewing literature data can improve article significance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Literature Review of chronic pain management and osteomyelitis with case report	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is correct.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes with new title.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There is no new scientific findings in this article, but it can be of importance in clinical practice.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	This part can be improved by adding some new references.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Can be published after corrections.	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Boris Ajdinović
Department, University & Country	Military Medical Academy, Serbia