

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_87645
Title of the Manuscript:	Unravelling the Possibilities Of Achieving Full Enteral Feeds During Therapeutic Hypothermia Without Adverse Effects-A Retrospective Observational Study In A Tertiary Neonatal Intensive Care.
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:

(<https://www.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>ALTHOUGH IT IS NOT A SPECIALIST ON THIS SUBJECT, THE REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE WAS PERFORMED FROM THE TECHNICAL POINT OF VIEW AND OVERALL IT COMPLIED WITH THE GUIDELINES OF THE JOURNAL. WE ACHIEVED OUR STUDY AND WE ARE POSSIBLE TO GET THE FOLLOWING INDICATIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- THE TITLE IS VERY BROAD WHY WE SUGGEST IT BE REFORMULATED AND ABOVE ALL MORE PURPOSE ACCORDING TO THE WORK PERFORMED.</li> <li>2- THE SUMMARY DOES NOT MEET THE INDICATIONS OF THE JOURNAL FOR THIS ITEM;               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A)- WAS DRAWN UP USING OTHER CONCEPTS.</li> <li>B) THREE OBJECTIVES ARE DEFINED IN THE SUMMARY, WHICH SOON DO NOT APPEAR IN THE INTRODUCTION OF THE ARTICLE..</li> <li>C)- IT HAS 302 WORDS AND THE INDICATED IS 250 WORDS.</li> <li>D- THE ABBREVIATIONS WERE NOT IDENTIFIED.</li> <li>E- IT DOES NOT HAVE A PROPER INTRODUCTION.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3- IN THE INTRODUCTION THE PURPOSE OF THE WORK IS NOT DEFINE.</li> <li>4- ABBREVIATIONS APPEAR IN THE ARTICLE THAT DO NOT DESCRIBE THEIR MEANING. ABBREVIATIONS ARE ABUSED THROUGHOUT THE ARTICLE.</li> <li>5- IT WOULD BE GOOD NOT TO ABUS ABBREVIATIONS IN THE DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS</li> <li>6- METHODS DO NOT DESCRIBE THE METHODS USED. IF IT TALKS ABOUT A GUIDE FORM, IT DOES NOT APPEAR IN THE ARTICLE.</li> <li>7- IT IS NOT DEFINED IN WHICH COUNTRY THE RESEARCH WAS CARRIED OUT, (APPARENTLY IT WAS IN INDIA).</li> <li>8- RESULTS ARE SPEAKING ABOUT TWO TABLES, BUT THEY WERE NOT PLACED IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE AND STAYED AS ANEXES, NO INDICATION.</li> <li>9- ALL THE WORK PERFORMED WAS SUMMARIZED IN 6 LINES AND THE TABLES WERE NOT PLACED AS PART OF THE RESULT.</li> <li>10- IN THE DISCUSSION THE RESULTS OF TABLES No. 1 and No.2. LITERATURE IF USED TO EXPLAIN OTHER WORKS, BUT THEY WERE NOT COMPARED WITH THE WORK PERFORMED.</li> <li>11- IN THE CONCLUSION IT WAS VERY SIMPLE AND PART OF IT IS A SUGGESTION AND NOT PART OF A CONCLUSION OF THE WORK DONE.</li> <li>12- THE BIBLIOGRAPHY IS UPDATED WITH MOST REFERENCES FROM THE 2000'S ON.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<b>THE ARTICLE UNDERLINED IN SEVERAL COLORS IS ADDED WITH ITS ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	THE AUTHOR(S) MUST REVIEW THE ARTICLE AND ADJUST THE INDICATIONS OF THE JOURNAL.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Havana University, Cuba</b>