Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_85092**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Frequency of common congenital anomalies among neonates in tertiary care hospital: A cross-sectional study**
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	The results section of the abstract should be better written. The acronyms CNS, CVS and GIT are relatively well known in the medical field, but not necessarily by everyone who will be able to read this manuscript. It is also important to review the percentages described. The citation of references throughout the text must precede the punctuation, either a comma or a period. The first paragraph on page 3 needs to be completely rewritten. Furthermore, there is no reference cited therein. The methodology section is very succinct. There is no information on which tests were performed on patients for the diagnosis of different types of congenital anomalies. Was only physical examination performed? How did they diagnose cases of CVS, for example? Did the study not include imaging or laboratory tests? What analyzes or tests were performed on the SPSS software? Similarly, the results and discussion are superficial, and basically include sociodemographic aspects of the studied sample. Few clinical data on patients are presented. In the discussion, comparisons are primarily made with African populations, they could be further explored in relation to other continents.	
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Children Hospital Larkana - Pakistan, from April to October 2018 (need to include the country). "All the newborns were assessed by history" (clinical?, familiar? What kind of history) CVS anomalies were found in 11.3%. Not in 2,4% as described. Introduction: **Page 2:** **or later in life," [1]**/ Correct for: or later in life [1]. **Many studies have been done**/ Correct for: Many studies have been conducted … incidence is highest among India 2.22%, (64.3%,) Bangladesh 1.75% ??? Throughout the text: Newborns /correct for: newborns &/ correct for: and	
Optional/General comments	The article needs an extensive language revision.	

Review Form 1.6

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Raquel de Souza Gestinari**
Department, University & Country	**Institute of Biodiversity and Sustainability- NUPEM, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro – UFRJ, Brazil**