

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_123853
Title of the Manuscript:	Rotavirus infection among hospitalized children under five years of age with acute watery diarrhoea in Mogadishu Somalia: A Tertiary hospital Study.
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is very important for the scientific community because of the prevalence of gastroenteritis among children under 5 years worldwide. Rotavirus infection which is the leading cause of diarrhea among children has high mortality rate than some chronic diseases	Okay
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Prevalence of rotavirus infection among hospitalised children under five years of age with acute diarrhea in Mogadishu Somalia	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The write up in the introduction/background of the study in the abstract section should be reduced/summarized, the method section should be more concise with more relevant information. The result section should be written properly. For each percentage figure written, the frequency should also be written together with it. I do not know if discussion was stated by this journal, otherwise, it is usually not required in the abstract section. There should be conclusion section in the abstract and it should be direct and straight to the point..	Noted
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The first part of the result section should be demographic characteristics of respondents not demographic factors. The method section should be re-written. The write-up in the result sections should be summarized to include relevant information and not all the information on the Tables. There are a lot of conflicting titles on the write-ups in the results section. The Ethical consideration section should be written well and the approval number obtained written clearly. The discussion section was not well written The reference section should be written well using the specified format	Done
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More recent references should be included. Recent studies have been conducted on this study. Also no references were cited in the discussion section. It is important to cite authors when comparing their studies with the study conducted.	Corrected as suggested
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The method was written in form of proposal. The authors should report their methods as a study that has already been conducted.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Major revision needed	

PART 2:

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