



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_61185
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Procalcitonin Serum Levels in Children Younger than Five Years Old with Urinary Tract Infection
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/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript "Evaluation of Procalcitonin Serum Levels in Children Younger than Five Years Old with Urinary Tract Infection" represents a very interesting work, focused on procalcitonin, a potential useful biomarker candidate for the patients suffering from vesicoureteral reflux.</p> <p>However, I have some recommendations that could improve the quality of the manuscript follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is recommended to specify the method by which the PCT level was determined.</li> <li>- Considering that the study was conducted between 2013 and 2014, it is recommended to indicate the time of determination of PCT values and the conditions of storage of serum samples, if applicable.</li> <li>- Given the relatively limited number of samples under analysis, I consider it necessary to mention the limitations of this study, as a separate note at the end of the Discussion chapter.</li> <li>- It would also be recommended to add, in the Conclusions chapter, some remarks on potential future studies on the analysis of this candidate biomarker.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the manuscript is well-written and requires minor changes, but the final decision of publishing it belongs to the Editor.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Simona Mihai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Victor Babes National Institute of Pathology, Romania</b>