



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_43239
Title of the Manuscript:	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF BIRTH WEIGHT AND GENDER OF NEW BORN INFANTS
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sd-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The method of citation is not in agreement with the journal's method, kindly read author guidelines and cite the reference in square brackets for example [1]</li> <li>- Data Presentation and Analysis + Hypothesis testing calculations are not required in the paper – the authors can just mention the type of data, and the method applied and the value of statistical significance (<i>P</i>).</li> </ul> <p>[1] - <a href="http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/132/authors-instruction">http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/132/authors-instruction</a></p>	We are sorry about that. The proper citation has been done.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Abstract may be divided into sections like Background (line 6 -9), Methods (line 10 - 12), Results (line13 - 21) &amp; Conclusions (line 22 - 23)</li> <li>- Conclusion is lacking from the abstract</li> </ul> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 30 – Please mention the rationale of taking Macrosomia &gt; 4kg in your place (either mention a reference to some study or mention that the place where the study was performed has population which is considered smaller compared to American data)</li> <li>- Line 40 – it would be advised that APGAR at 1<sup>st</sup> min is used rather than APGAR1</li> <li>- Line 56 – 57 – not required</li> <li>- Line 63 – energy is not supplied across the membranes, only nutrients are</li> </ul> <p>Materials &amp; Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 81 – gestational age was</li> <li>- Line 82 – Babies were weighed</li> <li>- Line 84 kg were</li> <li>- Line 86 – were calculated</li> <li>- Please mention if twin gestations were included or excluded from the study</li> </ul> <p>Data Presentation and Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 89 – 135 – Since the paper has been submitted to a medical journal and the research question and hypothesis revolve around a medical interest, it is not required to mention the detailed statistics which have been applied to the data.</li> </ul>	<p>The abstract has been divided into sections. Conclusion is also included.</p> <p>Thanks for pointing out all these errors. They have all been addressed as shown in the highlighted areas in the text.</p> <p>The detailed statistical procedures have been removed.</p>

	<p>- Line 88 – A simple description in 2 – 3 sentences of the methods used to statistically analyse the data will suffice, an explanation of statistical tests is not needed.</p> <p>- Table 1 with line 161 is sufficient</p> <p>- Table 2 with line 180, 192 and 207 is sufficient</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>- Instead of separately mentioning the M(sd) the authors can make the paper more clear by using M±SD and the P values for the same can be incorporated in table 2 to make it very pristine</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>- Line 228 – 229 – use of a cohesive device between both the sentences</p> <p>- Line 231 – The study by Swende was published in 2011, .....but not in agreement with Swende</p> <p>Line 247 – repeated line from</p> <p>Line 248 &amp; 249 – repeated line from</p> <p>Line 251 – 252 – depends on it's genetic predisposition</p>	<p>This has been done.</p> <p>This has been corrected.</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

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