

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_118161
Title of the Manuscript:	Ebstein anomaly in an adolescent: A 'Miranda warning' against blaming Sickle Cell Cardiomyopathy - A case-based scholarly update
Type of the Article	Case study

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>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>We fully appreciate the effort made by colleagues to accomplish this report. The topic itself is of great importance. It is interesting to have such a report, it represents one of the rare pathology that should be considered.</p> <p>Having professed my general enthusiasm for the topic and its importance, I have some concerns that I feel are tractable but require substantive effort. Our ambition is for the research formula to be in keeping with the pure scientific method, so we wanted to include a set of notes that we see as necessary to prepare the manuscript in a more sedate way that achieves the purpose of academic publishing.</p> <p><u>My comments here are concerned solely with the re organization of the manuscript. Consideration of these points will, I believe, lead to an improved report that better illustrates the key concepts and conclusions.</u></p> <p><u>If the authors are able to clarify the few limitations, add a helpful conceptual model, and revise the report to clarify the interpretation and application of this manuscript for the journal audience, this should make a nice addition to the literature.</u></p> <p><u>I recommend the manuscript for publication after some adjustments have been taken into account.</u></p> <p><u>Please pay attention, review the attached comments (yellow colored icons in the main text), and rewrite the article accordingly as possible.</u></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>However, the English editing would probably need to be revised using more re-organization of the manuscript format (the manuscript needs to be edited for grammar and syntax).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Joudi Aboud
Department, University & Country	The Maternity and Child Teaching Hospital, Iraq