

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_128664
Title of the Manuscript:	SHORT-TERM EVOLUTION OF NEWBORNS FROM MOTHERS WITH BASEDOW'S DISEASE: ABOUT 137 CASES
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: 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Graves' disease is the most common cause of clinically significant hyperthyroidism. - Graves' disease can cause thyroid dysfunction in the newborn - Diagnostic efforts should be made in the fetal period to avoid neonatal complications - Poor control of hyperthyroidism can be responsible for growth retardation intrauterine, goiter, cardiac and neurological complications and perinatal mortality among others	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Short-term clinical characteristics in newborns of mothers with Basedow disease: Retrospective cohort study	
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.	In terms of material and method, it is necessary to specify that this is a descriptive retrospective cohort study. The unit of analysis must be indicated and if the sample was census, that is, all cases were considered or, failing that, if any sampling was carried out. Likewise, it is necessary to mention that this is a review of secondary data with prior authorization from the institution's research committee and for those who received the call with prior informed consent.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is a pertinent, relevant research that provides the scientific community with important data, it is only necessary to add the ethical part that was fulfilled	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is important to carry out the discussion with references that are not more than five years old and are mostly from articles published in indexed journals for the necessary relevance.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	If it is clear	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Luisa Mirtha Estrada Chiroque. Servicio de Emergencia de
Department, University & Country	Hospital Nacional Edgardo Rebagliati Martins, Perú