



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_66672
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE PERSPECTIVES OF TURKS AND ARABS ON MOTHER'S MILK BANKING
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The subject is interesting because it addresses the issue of the convictions of individual populations on the possibility of giving the surplus breast milk to infants who cannot receive their mother's milk. The benefits of human milk and the usefulness of donated milk banks should be better specified and also that it is not possible for premature infants to attack the breast until a certain gestational age, but milk must be extracted, collected and treated.</p> <p>Everything has been included in the Materials and Methods Use the classic schema of research article: Introduction Aim of the study Materials and methods Results Discussion Conclusion</p> <p>Check the correctness of statistical data</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Add some more information when talking about the other milk banks in addition to those on Brazil, with a brief description of the situation of human milk banking around the world and related bibliographical references.</p> <p>Specify the usefulness of the informations obtained from these statistical comparisons from the perspective of human milk banking in these countries. Add a small table to compendium the results of all hypotheses.</p> <p>The conclusions must be separated from the discussion.</p> <p>Indicate the limits and opportunities of the study.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Pasqua Anna Quitadamo
Department, University & Country	"Casa Sollievo della Sofferenza" Hospital, Italy