



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_48291
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological and clinical profiles of children aged 0-71 months suffering from acute diarrhea at Kalembe-lembe hospital in Kinshasa city, Democratic Republic of the Congo
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:

(<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	<p>1) The abstract should not exceed 300 words according to author's guidelines (but 447 words in this paper).</p> <p>2) Table 1: You must indicate the reference of your study population distribution method. Why 0-11 month an 12-71 month. Why not 0-1 month, 1-12 month, 12-48 month and 48-71 month. This distribution is usually use in paediatric medicine.</p> <p>3) Table 1: the percentages indicated are not very clear. N=? by age groups. Did you really recorded 100% deaths?</p> <p>4) Why the distribution of age group is different for tables 1 and 2?</p> <p>5) Conclusion is too long. Summarize the paragraph concerning recommendations in two or three lines..</p>	<p>The abstract is corrected according to the author's guidelines but it still has 311 words.</p> <p>Yes, but this table gives us an overview of the monthly distribution of cases of deaths due to acute diarrhoea during the period from 1 January to 31 December 2015. 29 deaths were recorded for the year 2015; representing 100%. The age distribution of deceased patients was intended to highlight the death rate of children considered more fragile (0-11 months) compared to others (12-71 months).</p> <p>As noted above, this table presents the monthly distribution of deaths due to acute diarrhoea. During our study period, there are months when no deaths have been reported (January and July for example this explains the fact that we had 0 everywhere.</p> <p>Table 1 shows us the monthly distribution of deaths related to acute diarrhoea during the year 2015; the age distribution of children who died from acute diarrhoea divides patients into two groups: 0-11 months (because these children are considered very fragile) compared to those in advanced ages (12-71 months), the idea was to compare the mortality rate between these two age groups.</p> <p>The conclusion has been now shortened and the recommendations as well.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1- Line 71-76 : In my view, it is not necessary to give in introduction the methodology steps</p> <p>2- Line 195: Rewrite Etiological</p>	<p>Ok, it has been corrected. The methodological part was placed in the right section. Ok, the correction has been inserted.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>1) Line 126-127: Your statistical analysis not revealed a significant in variation in cases of diarrhea in the population of this region. Is this analysis concerned only monthly distribution of cases or both monthly distribution of cases and number of male and female children. I think 17 is significatively different to 47.</p> <p>2) Line 245-251: In my view, you compare your results with the studies which take place before 2000 for many references. is it not possible to find more recent work on this topic.</p>	<p>The statistical analysis concerned the monthly distribution of cases and we made a correlation between these cases and the number of male and female children. The correlation done didn't reveal any significant difference but considering the frequency of cases each month there is of course a significant difference as you highlighted.</p> <p>It is difficult to find recent studies on acute diarrhea, thus the importance of this paper. In case, you have some more recent works, please would you mind sending them to us so that we can improve this manuscript.</p>

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)	