

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_129427
Title of the Manuscript:	Serum Lactic Acid: A Predictor of Septic Shock in Childhood Cancers with Febrile Neutropenia in a Tertiary Care Hospital in Bangladesh
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>

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.	Febrile neutropenia is an emergency for patients with leukemia. It is a life-threatening condition. Serum lactate levels are present in AABG reports which are widely available now. So, it can be easily used to prognosticate patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	It is comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There are few concerns- In the methodology, patients with hemodynamic compromise have been excluded while author is looking for predictor of septic shock is only. Reason for excluding patients with fever more than 72 hrs not explained while the likelihood of going into shock would increase with prolonged illness. Flow of study not depicted graphically.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Majority of references not recent no. 2,4,5,7, 8,9, 10,11, 12, 14, 15, 17 are more than 5 years old. 12 out of 17 references are not recent. The author should include more recent references.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sujaya Mukhopadhyay
Department, University & Country	Govt. Institute of Medical Sciences, India