

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_103690
Title of the Manuscript:	“Assessment of intelligence quotient (IQ) and behavior in children post cardiac surgery in early childhood- a prospective observational study”.
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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- Yes, I think this manuscript has some importance to the medical field. The authors in this study were trying to assess the association between having a cardiac surgery and level of intelligence and behaviour in children patients. The authors also tried to evaluate the effect of other secondary factors.</p> <p>2- Yes, I think the article title is suitable.</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract looks comprehensive but I recommend that the results subsection in this abstract is rewritten to accurately reflect numbers in this manuscript.</p> <p>4- Yes, I think this manuscript is structured in the appropriate way.</p> <p>5- Yes, I believe this manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- I think the references in this manuscript are recent and enough.</p> <p>7- Some paragraphs in introduction are left with no citation.</p> <p>8- I recommend to include “intelligence quotient” and “behavior” in the keywords.</p> <p>9- Authors are advised to state the meaning of many abbreviations in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Writing quality is good but some punctuation mistakes must be corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq