



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_34810
Title of the Manuscript:	The Pattern and Trend of Non-Communicable Diseases in Children in Jos, North Central Nigeria: A Four-Year Review
Type of the Article	~~Retro~~ 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>)



[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	The paper looks like a mere narration and not correlation is documented on risk and only focus on admission trend and pattern and not clear indications of action taken and outcomes- the title is inappropriate 1-Sentences are too long and very complex. Authors should use simple max 2.5 line sentence rather than 4-6 lines as documented in the introduction down to conclusion 2a- the introduction should include Africa and Nigeria context CDs versus NCDs rather provided global burden? This can help to have a clear picture of the trend or pattern overtime 2b- Ok Sickle cell disease (SCD), is a chronic diseases what are CD or SCD? 2c- so many abbreviations that make the readings and tables difficult to comprehend 3- The burden of diseases in children is shifting from communicable to non-communicable Diseases, how did author got this conclusion when	Noted. See corrected manuscript The study was essentially a review of admission register, to identify the pattern and trends of admissions in the emergency paediatric unit. These patients leave this unit to other units of the hospital hence the outcome data of all the patients could not be retrieved hence that aspect was not considered in the study Corrected This has been included List of abbreviations has been added List of abbreviations has been added Noted a table and figure has been added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	there is not communicable diseases as comparator? 4-The English language is weak and so many error and difficult sentence that make the reading hard to grab and uneven flow or conflicting statements or arguments 5- some references are not correct and this is a major challenged of the paper wrong referencing of papers(unmatched sentences and references) The paper requires more intense and appropriate attention. There are so many missing information and the data processing and analysis is weak Please check for plagiarism as there are many incoherence indicating Copy and Paste and NO LOGICAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	Noted and corrected Corrected Noted and corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Methodology is very scanty and some key information in clear approach is missing - Not inclusion criteria or exclusion for example the follow up was uniform or odd? - - Key indices and variables extracted - - Quality assessment is not reported - - Categorization metrics and tools - - Correlation assessment between trend and pattern and NCDs burden not found	Noted. See corrected manuscript. Inclusion and exclusion have been included in the methodology, The patients were not followed up. This information has been included in the methodology Not applicable to this study Correction effected See tables 1, 2 and figure 1
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		