Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Pediatric Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPR_130693**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Global developmental delay and the impact of overindulgence: A case series on global developmental delay, the excessive pampering, and the consequences of overindulgence in children**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	• This manuscript is importance because the study is new and used scientific approach. • The manuscript is importance because it contributes to the new knowledge. • The study finding is empirical and therefore worth the attention of scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title of the article is indispensably suitable as it is, because the title is rooted in the research area	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensible because it captures the objective of the study, method used, findings, conclusion and keywords. However, the abstract did not reach 300 words which is the standard, and therefore suggests that the writer increase the abstract size to the stipulated standard of 300 words.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is consistent with the scientific study; however, the study has insufficient literatures to substantiate the findings. The size of the manuscript is too small in term of pages, because the standard is 25 pages	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are insufficient because they are only 11, however the standard number of pages ranges from 30 to 40 references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and the quality of article is suitable; however, there is widespread grammatical and punctuation errors that need to be worked on in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is generally good because the study is new and therefore its finding contributes to the knowledge. However, the scholar is advised to work on the followings: • Increase the size of the abstract to 300 words, • Increase the reference materials to be between 30 to 40. • Backup the findings of the case study with literatures • Increase the size of the manuscript to 25 pages	

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:	**Abraham Ngor Achiek**
Department, University & Country	**Texila American University, South Sudan**