

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_93114
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Heart Rate Variability in Children with Congenital Heart Diseases Before and After Surgical Repair
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:

(<https://www.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy>)

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><u>01</u> "Congenital heart diseases (CHDs) remain a It is the main cause of illness and death (...)" Rephrase this sentence. Can the authors notice that there is a huge mistake in syntax?</p> <p><u>02</u> "Earlier investigations have focused on heart rate variability (HRV) in certain cardiac abnormalities like tetralogy of Fallot." Which 'earlier investigations'? Where are the references?</p> <p><u>03</u> "The Ethics Committee, Faculty of Medicine, Tanta University had approved the study." Please provide the Ethical Committee registry/approval number.</p> <p><u>04</u> No power analysis was performed. Therefore, it is not possible to know whether the analysis of the results of the present study is a true finding or a pure chance. This may compromise the entire validity of this study.</p> <p><u>05</u> Most of the Discussion section consists of paragraphs beginning with a repetition of the results followed by the citation of the results of other studies, without an actual discussion of the findings of the study. In other words, a discussion of the findings is inexistent.</p> <p><u>06</u> The limitations of the study were neither pointed out nor discussed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bruno Chrcanovic
Department, University & Country	Malmö University, Sweden