



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_48579
Title of the Manuscript:	Pyridinium Crosslinks (Pyd) In the Urine is Associated With Stunting In Neonates
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>To authors, The theme is interesting. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study number was small. Please indicate whether this small number can conclude something. 2. Please define "stunted neonates" in this study. Please describe its criteria. If it was height 48 cm or less, then, state it in Materials. 3. Conclusion: you wrote, "Therefore, based on this study, it has been shown that, <i>Pyd</i> in the urine can be utilized as a potential indicator of stunting among neonates.". This should be, for example, " <i>Pyd</i> was significantly higher in the urine from stunted neonates than non-stunted neonates. Urine <i>Pyd</i> may become a candidate of a marker of stunted neonates. Further study on a large population is necessary". 4. English should be edited extensively. 	<p>1. Yes, even though the small number of participants/babies, the results shows significance statistically.</p> <p>Calculation of samples were done via Fisher = [Ariawan (1997)]</p> $\zeta = 0,5 \ln \left[\frac{1+r}{1-r} \right]$ <p>r = coefficient correlation 0.44 (Branca <i>et al.</i> 1992) and calculation of sample size were done this way:</p> $n = \left[\frac{Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + Z_{1-\beta}}{\zeta} \right]^2 + 3$ <p>n = number of samples</p> <p>Calculated using using Fisher:</p> $\zeta = 0,5 \ln \left[\frac{1+0,44}{1-0,44} \right] = 0,472231$ $n = \left[\frac{Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + Z_{1-\beta}}{\zeta} \right]^2 + 3$ $n = \left[\frac{2,58 + 1,28}{0,472231} \right]^2 + 3 = 69,81$ <p>Ref: Ariawan I. 1997. Besar dan Metode Sampel pada Penelitian Kesehatan. Jurusan Statistik dan Kependudukan, Fakultas Kesehatan Masyarakat, Universitas Indonesia: Jakarta.</p> <p>Branca F, Robins SP, Ferro-Luzzi A & Golden MHN (1992): Bone turnover in</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		malnourished children. Lancet 340, 1493-1496.
		2. Already included – in yellow highlight 3. Already edited - in yellow highlight 4. We used grammarly
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	