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	**Comparative Retrospective study**

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 topic is of interest. Methodology: Age at corrective surgery and whether one stage or two stage surgery was used in this cohort has not been mentioned. Placement of drain through the anastomosis in the pulled through segment is not classically done for Duhamel and so needs to be explained. The term anorectal stenosis in relation to Duhamel operation and its cause (pathogenesis and diagnosis) in this patient cohort needs to be clearly explained. 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 The statistical test/s used for calculation of significance is not mentioned. Sample size calculation method is not clear. Discussion 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. The discussion does not aim to derive clinically useful conclusions. References: 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. 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.	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Conjeevaram Rajendra Rao Thambi Dorai**
Department, University & Country	**EX University Malaya, Malaysia**