



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                          |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</a>                      |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2015_BJAST_17451                                                                         |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Prediction of Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation through Spectral and Statistical Techniques |
| 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                            | <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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments |                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      |                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | I'm doubting concerning valuable results of this study due to very small amount of analyzed ECG (10 vs 10). I think that size should be greater. | Agreed. This will be taken care in the further works...                                                                                                                                     |