



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_CA_18110
Title of the Manuscript:	Non Linear analysis of Heart Rate variability improves differential diagnosis between Parkinson Disease and Multiple System Atrophy
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

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The Tables are not friendly. Caption should be more explanatory of abbreviations. I suggest in table 1 to stratify the patients by age, treatment and disease, for instance. There are many <u>non-significant</u> variables that are not either discussed or emphasised. For instance, a more detailed explanation for NL HRV in pD and MSA why it should be different between them (table 4) and also that it would be only useful during awakeness. Discussion is too short for so many results	Tables have been edited accordingly. The possible physiological meaning of the NL HRV parameters has been more detailed, including also four new references. Several statements have been also added in the discussion section.
Minor REVISION comments	SD should be preceded by $\pm$ or using SE instead. Use the same format for numbers (dot or comma) Please amend $p=0.05$ for $p<0.05$, line 144. P value at 0.05 is hardly significant (please check table 4).	The requested modifications have been done. The probability level of $P < .05$ was chosen as the least significant difference. (P had been reported in the first manuscript as = 0.05 only because that one was the indication in the authors guidelines)
Optional/General comments	Including "highly probably or uncertain diagnosis" is a strong bias that compromise the results and the conclusion of the study. I agree that differences are seen, obviously with control group. Therefore, I would not dare to conclude so categorically that is a reliable tool to differentiate both diseases. So I would use conditional verbal form	Changed in the conditional verbal form