

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_101973
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Cardiac Functions in Children Suffering from Celiac Disease
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes. Due to the amplitude of occurrence of this type of pathology.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Descriptive and easy-to-understand summary, reporting the pathology, method, results and conclusion.</p> <p>Introduction covering the pathology, its effects on the body, reporting the hypotheses of evolution for heart diseases. Objective according to the theme of the work.</p> <p>Well-descriptive and easy-to-understand methodology for replicating new studies on the subject of the work.</p> <p>Table I, III and IV, the data in these tables are in accordance with the data in the development of the text.</p> <p>Table II failed to report the significant values in relation to height Z-score, weight Z-score.</p> <p>In table II, serum vitamin D values are at <math>p &lt; 0.001</math> and in the text, as well as in the results and discussion, serum vitamin D values are at <math>p &lt; 0.003</math>. I recommend checking this data.</p> <p>Wide discussion and covering all data from the results acquired in the research.</p> <p>Conclusion according to the objective of the work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I suggest checking the data on serum vitamin D at work.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Fabiano Rito Macedo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>State University of Amazonas, Brazil</b>