



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_50527
Title of the Manuscript:	Severity of Asthma and Serum Vitamin D Levels in Asthmatic Children
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>)

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	All the results must be presented separately for male and female since as stated in the introduction and later in the discussion the Vit D levels are different among the two genders. In the tables the AA have to specify the numbers of each subgroup together with the sex of the participants.	Corrected as suggested Done
Minor REVISION comments	In the introduction the AA present in general the possible action of Vit D on the immune reactivity of the subjects: I suggest that they stick on asthma and/or on respiratory system. It is not relevant for this paper to say that Vit D reduce the incidence of cancer or so.	Okay
Optional/General comments	The Vit D levels are below the suggested normal limits in all the population tested but the prevalence of asthma is not increased in this population. Nonetheless it seems, but statistically not significant, that lower levels of Vit D are associate with higher asthma severity. Separating males and females may help in understanding these results . The relative low prevalence of asthma in this population might be explained by other factors such as diet or environmental pollutions or... In tab.3 it appears that children never supplemented with Vit D have higher levels of Vit D: what is the suggested explanation. May it be that this groups have different age and as the AA have shown the younger have higher levels of Vit D?	Corrected and effected

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>	