



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>                                                                                          |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2013_IJTDH_6031                                                                                                                                                 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Clinical Study of Trans-catheter Closure of Patent Ductus Arteriosus with Occluder Devices: Evaluating the efficacy of different devices and the outcome</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Research Paper</b>                                                                                                                                           |

**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)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objective of the study should be more clear. Its better to mention primary and secondary objectives.</li> </ul> <p>Most Importantly- Authors themselves are stating that size of duct and experience of cardiologist were the best predictor of outcome as the incidence of complications were more during the first 2 years of their study. These would then be important confounding factors (particularly the 2<sup>nd</sup> one) which can affect their results. Hence their primary objective cannot be to compare the complication rates among different devices. It could be for eg - "Our experience with occluder devices over last 5 years".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authors should clearly mention about the study design/ study population – both in abstract and main manuscript.</li> <li>- Abstract – Results- Not clear – If objective is to evaluate the efficacy of different devices, then it should clearly reflect in results and conclusion.</li> </ul> | <p>We have made the objectives of the study clearer. This has been divided into primary and secondary objectives. See page 1,abstract and page 8,line 6-7</p> <p>We have made the statement 'Our experience with occluder devices over last 5 years". Our first objective.See page 1,abstract and page 8,line 6-7</p> <p>We have clearly mention about the study design/ study population – both in abstract and main manuscript. See abstract page 1 and methods, page 5,first paragraph</p> <p>We have rectified this. See abstract page 1,line 21-27</p> |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                         | <p><b>Main manuscript- Instead of describing the operative notes in detail, should more focus on how the study was carried and how data was collected.</b></p> <p><b>It is better if they compare the efficacy of different devices in a fixed size PDA group. Eg if the medium sized PDA was commonest, then to compare the complication rates among different devices in that group.</b></p> | <p><b>We have clearly mentioned how the study was carried out both in abstract and main manuscript. See abstract page 1 and methods, page 5,first paragraph</b></p> <p><b>We have done our best possible to recast table III to capture this</b></p> |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments   | <p><b>Title can be revised- Better to describe age group here and Institute name can be omitted here.</b></p> <p><b>Discussion - A table can be given - comparing the results of this study with previous similar studies.</b></p> <p><b>Fig 1:- Improvement in skills – How it is calculated ?</b></p>                                                                                        | <p><b>We have revised the title to capture the age group and we also removed the Institute name here. See page 1.</b></p> <p><b>This was calculated by plotting success rate over years, and then choosing the best line of fit</b></p>              |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments | <p><b>Name of the Institute can be omitted at certain places.</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <p><b>We have done this</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |