

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_76036
Title of the Manuscript:	Neonatal morbidity pattern among infants born to diabetic mothers at Jamhouria hospital, Benghazi- Libya
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Reviewer comment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cover page: avoid table of contents in your manuscript. Put authors affiliation in the cover page 2. in the abstract section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too long introduction in the abstract section is not recommended, you have to revise it based on the journal guideline. - Background is the component of introduction and no need to write background separately in the abstract section. - It will be nice, if you write the introduction section of the abstract by considering the components of introduction (background, statement of the problem, and significance of the study) -the background in this section is incomplete sentence. - Your objective is not SMART. So you have to make it SMART. - Method in the abstract- The method section is not informative. So you have to explain the method in brief and informative way. Result - Avoid abbreviations/acronyms in the abstract section. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What percent of the study participants. - Conclusion- Where is the pattern of neonatal mortality. - Put the keywords at the end of the abstract. 3. Introduction section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It will be nice, if use consistent referencing style. Most of the contents in the introduction section lacks reference. - Your introduction lacks consistency, and components of introduction (definition, cause, proposed solutions/treatments). Generally you have to revise your introduction based on the comments given and considering the facts related to your topic. - The introduction section lacks clearly defined statement of problem. - Did not show the gap, the known and unknown 	

Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The consequence and severity of the problem- Tried solutions previously...- The introduction section is too long and difficult to conceptualize. So you have to make it precise and informative and logically connected. <p>4. Where is the justification of the study, significance of the study?????? It lacks justification.</p> <p>5. Literature section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Too long literature review is not recommended. You have to make it concise and informative.- The font is not consistent- It lacks reference, which may raise issue of plagiarism- If the review is mandatory, you have to write it separately using sub-titles <p>6. The aim of the study is not SMART.</p> <p>7. Correct patient and method as "Method and materials"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- What are the source and study population, where is the sample size calculation?- Where is the operational definition?- Where is ethical consideration?- Where is the variables of the study (the dependent and independent)?- Where is the study area and period?- Where is the quality control mechanism?- Overall the methodology section needs major revision. <p>8. Result section</p> <p>The sum is not equal to 100. Do not repeat the result by figure and word.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Most of the table is not explanatory. You have to make it easily understandable.- Most of the tables and figures lack number.- Putting one figure in one page is not recommended. And the figure has no number.- The result needs modification.- You have to concise your result by reducing the figures and table size, removing duplicated writings, and focus on your objective.- Remove short tables, and the figures and tables should be self-	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.6

	<p>explanatory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Where is the pattern of mortality? Since your title is on pattern of mortality. <p>9. Discussion section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In the first paragraph of the discussion section- No need to write this. You have to compare the result of yours with other literatures by putting the reference.- There was no reference for literatures.- The way you write the discussion is not correct. You have to revise the discussion by writing your main finding and comparing it with other literatures and discuss discrepancies with possible explanations. <p>10. Conclusion section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Have you answered the objective of the study???? <p>11. Recommendation section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The way you write the recommendation was not correct. You have to revise it based your main finding.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Grammatical and spelling revision needed- Flow of idea need to be revised- Too long paragraph in the introduction and literature review, makes the manuscript difficult to read and identify the concept.- Most of the literatures lack reference	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Moges Mareg
Department, University & Country	Dilla University, Ethiopia