

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83730
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge about Complication of Congenital Hypothyroidism among parents in Aseer region, Saudi Arabia
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:

(<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 manuscript describes an interesting investigation of the knowledge around congenital hypothyroidism in the general population of the Aseer region in Saudi Arabia.</p> <p>The manuscript ought to clearly present to how many families the questionnaire was sent and how many answered the questionnaire. Sent to 1086 families and answered by 362 (33,3%). This is important, since one could foresee a bias in the willingness to take part depending on the knowledge about CH.</p> <p>Reference numbers ought to be corrected. At the end of page two the authors refer to reference 9 but the correct reference here seems to be 10 and the same is the case with the next two references in the text 10 ought to be 11 and 11 be 12. From 13 and on it is correct. The reference 9 is not involved in the text.</p> <p>Table 1. In the legend it says 1086 participants but then in the table 100% is equal to 362. Is this the number of families who have answered the questionnaire? If you have written this in the beginning of the results, you do not need to mention the 1086 again, since the answers deal with 362 families. The fact that only 33,3% responded (if I have understood the data correctly) and possible consequences of that have to be discussed in the Discussion.</p> <p>Table 2. This Table could be presented as a Figure instead. The legend could contain the number of families who have given an answer. One column for each aspect on the X-axis and the percentage on the y-axis for each aspect, enabling an easy overview of the knowledge of different facts about CH in the responding group.</p> <p>What is thyroid toxicity in Table 2? Symptoms of over treatment?</p> <p>Table 3. Here 346 families said that they do not have a child with CH. This could be written in the legend to the Table. The Table could then contain the number of families with 1, 2, 3 and 4 or more. Here I do not understand the lower part of the Table. If doctor gave....Now 315 families say that they don't have any sick children. Please clarify.</p> <p>Table 4. Could be presented as a Figure in the same way as for Table 2.</p> <p>Table 5 What does total N=1020 stand for? Please explain in more detail how the data in this table was obtained.</p> <p>In the text there are several repetitions and at the same time the authors do not explain in enough detail how the data was obtained for the different analyses.</p> <p>The English needs correction. Example: Page2: "The study will include all Saudi parents who can read and write was included in the study".</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ulrika Von Döbeln
Department, University & Country	Karolinska Institutet, Sweden