SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIMPS_40776**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Questionable International Pediatric Studies in the United States and Russia Triggered by Regulatory Authorities**
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=sdi-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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**This is a study conducted to provide scientific evidence to challenge the rational for some clinical trials in the paediatric population. A few but important observations outlined below should be addressed by the authors.** **1. Study Method (lines 52-64) should be preceded by background to study (lines 66-93). This was not the case in this manuscript.** **2. Lines 57-59 need further clarification to avoid apparent contradictions: While disregarding studies involving "children, adolescents and adults", they included studies that recruited "children and young adults up to 18-30 years" and "birth to 17 years".** **3. Table 1 has no explanatory text except for the footnote. This should be provided.** **4. Tables 4 and 5 are sandwiched within the discussion section; they should be appropriately relocated.** **5. The referencing system is inconsistent and not in conformity with any standard referencing style.This should be revised in line with this Journal's recommendation. This flaw is illustrated below:** ➢ Shirkey H. Therapeutic Orphans. J Pediatr 72, 119-120 (1968) X ➢ Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Studies to Evaluate Drugs in Pediatric Populations. 242 Committee on Drugs. American Academy of Pediatrics. Pediatrics 1995, 95, 286-94 X	
Minor REVISION comments	Lines 32/33: PIP is repeated. Line 209: daily basis	
Optional/General comments	The Authors may consider toning down the language in the following expression to make it less offensive " **Parts of pediatric academia are sullied by industry funds channeled by regulatory 20 decisions into medically superfluous studies". Lines20-21**	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Audu Lamidi Isah***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Paediatrics, National Hospital Abuja, Nigeria***