

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_122329
Title of the Manuscript:	Predictors of Morbidity and Mortality of Gastrointestinal Perforation in Children
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	This manuscript addresses a clinically relevant issue by focusing on predictors of morbidity and mortality in paediatric gastrointestinal perforation. This type of study is valuable for the medical community, particularly in developing countries where timely access to treatment can be challenging. The research is important as it provides specific local data that can help improve paediatric care in critical surgical conditions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is clear and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract contains the main components, but it is overly descriptive and lacks clarity. The statistical results are presented in a crowded manner, making it difficult to follow. The authors should consider simplifying the language and clearly stating the significance of their findings. Additionally, it is essential to define the key acronyms like SSI and SIRS for readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	While the structure follows standard sections, there is a need for reorganization within some sections. The introduction should provide more context on why this study is necessary, focusing on gaps in existing literature. The methods section is detailed but could benefit from a clearer description of how patients were selected, as there is a risk of selection bias that isn't adequately addressed.	
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.	The manuscript's scientific foundation is mostly sound, but several methodological concerns must be addressed. The small sample size (n=40) raises questions about the statistical power of the findings. Authors must highlight that the results need to be interpreted with caution, given the potential biases.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally relevant and recent, but there are a few outdated sources that could be replaced with more current studies. Additionally, one or two more references on global perspectives could strengthen the discussion.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but there are several grammatical errors and awkward phrases. A thorough language review is recommended to improve clarity and flow.	
Optional/General comments	The study offers valuable insights but could be significantly improved with better data analysis and more rigorous discussion. The authors should focus on how this study's findings fit into the broader field and offer clear recommendations for clinical practice or future research.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ivan Maray
Department, University & Country	Hospital Universitario Central de Asturias, University of Oviedo, Spain