

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_89556
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of complication regarding modified Duhamel procedure in male to female children
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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	<p>The topic is of interest.</p> <p><u>Methodology</u>: Age at corrective surgery and whether one stage or two stage surgery was used in this cohort has not been mentioned.</p> <p>Placement of drain through the anastomosis in the pulled through segment is not classically done for Duhamel and so needs to be explained.</p> <p>The term anorectal stenosis in relation to Duhamel operation and its cause (pathogenesis and diagnosis) in this patient cohort needs to be clearly explained.</p> <p>The following details are lacking: A) the definition of constipation and enterocolitis, its time of occurrence B) cause /mechanism of postoperative intestinal obstruction & C) type of wound infection (site and type of SSI) are not mentioned</p> <p><u>The statistical test/s</u> used for calculation of significance is not mentioned. Sample size calculation method is not clear.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u> does not correlate the aims of the study with results of the study in a scientifically robust manner. The author should clarify the basis on which differences in outcome are expected between males and females following Duhamel procedure: the data that is provided and discussion should focus on this theme.</p> <p>The discussion does not aim to derive clinically useful conclusions.</p> <p><u>References</u>: Format of references is not uniform e g Ref 12. The names of journals in references do not follow recognized pattern. Despite the list of 16 references, they have not been used for a clear and relevant discussion of the topic of the manuscript.</p> <p>The language needs lot of improvement. Currently, the errors in language make understanding of the manuscript difficult in sections. Many errors in spelling and sentence format are noted.</p>	<p>This is one stage study</p> <p>This paper is a part of project. He detail has been mention in previous work.</p> <p>This paper is a part of project. He detail has been mention in previous work.</p> <p>Define in intro, highlighted Detail has been explained in previous paper</p> <p>Sample size calculated through Rao software</p> <p>Change and highlighted</p> <p>Rectified</p> <p>Rectified and highlighted</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>Yes</p>	