

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_99417
Title of the Manuscript:	The Association of Maternal Glycemic Control with Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy in Infants of Diabetic Mothers
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>The article is scientific relevant and presents an interesting result about patients with glycaemic disorder during pregnancy, it rise the question of, is it necessary something else than glycaemic control in this patients?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but needs corrections</p> <p>Is correct but is outdated</p> <p>Conclusion must be modified</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The study declare that the aim is the correlation of maternal glycemic control, in diabetic mothers, with the presence of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM) in their offspring, but there are two main problems with the design of the study; the fact that the investigators found a high incidence of HCM with no doubt is interesting and relevant but there's no evidence of the relation with the glycemic control of the mother, the mean HbA1c was normal, so it was the mean weight at birth and only 13% of new borne were overweight, the authors can suppose that during the gestational period mother could have glycemic variations that influence the fetus but the study do not allowed them to prove it, they did not found significant association or correlation between HbA1c levels and the absolute value of interventricular septum statistically, then they conclude that strict maternal glycemic control can reduce the incidence and severity of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. The other questionable aspect is that they cannot predict if this alterations are related to the intra-uterus environment and could be reversible, mainly when most of the babies were asymptomatic, besides the authors recognize that the HCM was associated to the presence of macrosomia, the presence of this condition in the neonates could be due to variables that were not controlled as the weight gain of the mother and gestational age at birth, even when those variables are less important than diabetes.</p> <p>In our opinion the conclusion must be modified, it should answered the question of the main objective declared and state the facts "There was found no association between HbA1c and the presence of HCM in neonates, symptomatic cases presenting with features of congestive cardiac failure or LVOT obstruction due HCM were not frequent, the presence of HCM was associated with macrosomia and hypoglycemia" the rest of the statements in the conclusions are not backed for the results, those comments can be done as the opinion of the authors as part of the discussion.</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:	Gilberto Cairo Sáez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Medica de Villa Clara, Cuba