



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_51115
Title of the Manuscript:	DIARRHOEA AND COMORBIDITIES SEEN AT UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT TEACHING HOSPITAL, NIGERIA
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Abstract</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Abstract is not properly structured. It should be structured as follows: Background; Objectives; Method; Result; Conclusion. The study design, location and duration of the study should be captured in the method section, and not written as a separate section in the abstract. • "Majority of those who died had acute watery diarrhoea (92.9%, p=0.35) had no dehydration (64.3%, p=0.00) and no comorbidity (57.1%, p=0.00)". This statement is not quite clear. Please present it in a better way. • "The study recorded very low mortality rate". Determining mortality rate was not part of your objectives. 2. <u>Methods</u> <p>"Information on Diarrhoea was retrieved from the nurse's clinic /ward record book". – Patient case notes would have been the most appropriate source of information. Some of the data reported in the results section are not usually documented in the nurse's record book.</p> 3. <u>Results</u> <p>The results of the study is poorly presented. A lot of ambiguity. The authors should re-write the result section. Also, results already presented as prose should not be repeated in figures or tables.</p> 4. <u>Conclusion</u> <p>No conclusion section. The authors should separate the conclusion from the discussion section. Furthermore, the conclusion of the authors should answer the research question which is usually captured in the study objectives.</p> 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Diarrhoea, particularly in children under 5 years is a condition of public health interest. I commend the authors for embarking on this study.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Unyime Eshiet
Department, University & Country	University of Uyo, Nigeria