

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71108
Title of the Manuscript:	SURGICAL OUTCOME OF HIRSCHSPRUNG'S DISEASE IN MALE CHILD: A RARE CASE REPORT
Type of the 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 (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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The article presents an excellent idea. Although the initial question is interesting, I have a few issues with the study. This article fits into the framework of translational orthopaedics: how to fill the gap between basic sciences and clinical sciences. An article like this can accelerate to understanding the SURGICAL OUTCOME OF HIRSCHSPRUNG'S DISEASE. The author can add a paragraph in the introduction to explain the idea in the context of translational orthopaedics. Example of articles should be cited:</p> <p>[1] Mediouni M, R Schlatterer D, Madry H, Cucchiarini M, Rai B. A review of translational medicine. The future paradigm: how can we connect the orthopaedic dots better? Curr Med Res Opin. 2018 Sep 27:1-26.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: good 2. Abstract: it captures the appropriate essence of the manuscript. Please reformulate the abstract like: Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusion 3. Introduction: The introduction is good. It identifies the problem that is being addressed in the manuscript and develops and states the purpose of the manuscript. 4. Figures: please provide a minimum an image to explain the problems. 5. References: I verify all references and all key references are correct. 6. Methods: 2 patients to validate this study is limited. Can you explain why this limitation? 7. Results: The results are very important and have clinical expectations. 8. Discussion: The authors don't discuss the limitations of this study. 9. Conclusion: reformulate the conclusion. The conclusion should be justified by the methods and results. The authors don't discuss future works. 10. I would like to know the point of view of authors about the validation of this study and determine the accuracy of this technique in a clinical setting. 	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.6

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mohamed Mediouni</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Bishop's University, Canada</i>