

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRCD_122300 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effects of Wolff-Parkinson-White Pattern on Anthropometric Variables and Blood Pressure Indices among Adult Nigerians of Yoruba Ethnicity |
| Type of the Article | research article |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>Despite the limitations, the study found no significant differences in blood pressure, heart rate, or other cardiovascular indices between the WPW and control groups. However, the lower BMI in the WPW group is an interesting finding that warrants further investigation.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>yes</p> | |
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p> | <p>Overall, the abstract is clear and concise, effectively summarizing the study. However, there are some areas where it could be strengthened: Strengthen the results: While the statistical results are presented, consider summarizing the key findings in plain language. For example, instead of stating "The mean SBP (mmHg), DBP (mmHg), HR (bpm), and PP (mmHg) for groups A and B were..." you could say "There were no significant differences in blood pressure, heart rate, or pulse pressure between individuals with and without the WPW pattern." Discuss implications: Briefly mention the potential implications of the findings. For example, you could state that the study suggests that the WPW pattern in young adults may not be associated with significant alterations in cardiovascular or anthropometric parameters. Clarify the WPW pattern: Briefly describe the Wolff-Parkinson-White (WPW) pattern for readers unfamiliar with the condition.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>The manuscript presents a clear and concise investigation into the relationship between the Wolff-Parkinson-White (WPW) pattern and anthropometric and cardiovascular indices in a young adult population. The study design, methodology, and data analysis are generally well-structured. However, the small sample size and retrospective nature of the study limit the strength of the conclusions.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>it is recommended to cite the more recent references.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>yes but there are linguistic errors</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Introduction: It provides a clear and concise definition of WPW pattern and syndrome., Effectively outlines the pathophysiology of WPW, including the role of the accessory pathway. and highlights the potential complications of WPW, such as tachyarrhythmias and sudden cardiac death. But it recommended to improve: Specificity of the research gap: While it is mentioned that the impact of WPW on anthropometric indices is underreported, it would be beneficial to further elaborate on the specific knowledge gaps in this area. For example, are there specific anthropometric parameters that have been studied about other congenital heart diseases but not WPW? Consistency in terminology: While the introduction correctly differentiates between WPW pattern and WPW syndrome, it could be more consistent in its usage. For example, the sentence "WPW pattern or syndrome has been described as congenital heart disease..." could be rephrased to clarify whether the focus is on the pattern or the syndrome. The reason for focusing on young adult Nigerians could be briefly explained. Is there a specific prevalence of WPW in this population, or are there other factors that make this group particularly relevant to the study? the material and methods section provides a basic framework for the study. However, it could be strengthened by: <input type="checkbox"/> Increase the sample size to improve statistical power. <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct a prospective study to reduce potential biases. <input type="checkbox"/> Explore additional factors that might influence the relationship between WPW and anthropometric parameters, such as the duration of WPW, the type of WPW pattern (intermittent or continuous), and the presence of other comorbidities. In the results section: Lack of detailed information: The results table lacks information on standard deviations for cardiovascular variables, which would provide a better understanding of the data variability. <input type="checkbox"/> Potential confounding factors: The study does not control for potential confounding factors, such as physical activity levels, smoking, or diet, which could influence the results. Results: the study found no significant differences in blood pressure, heart rate, or other cardiovascular indices between the WPW and control groups. However, the lower BMI in the WPW group is an interesting finding that warrants further investigation. The limitations: including small sample size and lack of standard deviation, are especially critical for this subgroup analysis (IWPWP group n=4). Due to the very small sample size, statistical tests might have low power to detect even large effects, leading to unreliable results. Overall, the discussion section provides a reasonable interpretation of the study findings in relation to the existing literature. However, it's important to emphasize that the study design does not allow for establishing causal relationships. The discussion should be cautious in attributing cause-and-effect relationships between variables. The discussion could further elaborate on the limitations of the study, such as the small sample size and the potential impact of these limitations on the interpretation of the findings. it could delve deeper into the specific clinical implications of the findings for patients with WPW. For example, what are the recommendations for follow-up care or lifestyle modifications based on the study results? The discussion could briefly outline potential directions for future research to address the limitations of the current study and to further explore the relationship between WPW and cardiovascular health. While the conclusion is clear, it could be strengthened by: -Briefly mentioning the limitations of the study, such as the small sample size, can add credibility to the</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | conclusion. -Emphasizing the importance of future studies with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up periods can provide direction for future research. | |
|--|---|--|

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: | Sura Lateef Alkhafaji |
| Department, University & Country | Kerbala University, Iraq |