



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_6031
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Study of Trans-catheter Closure of Patent Ductus Arteriosus with Occluder Devices: Evaluating the efficacy of different devices and the outcome
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Objective of the study should be more clear. Its better to mention primary and secondary objectives. 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 2nd 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". - Authors should clearly mention about the study design/ study population – both in abstract and main manuscript. - Abstract – Results- Not clear – If objective is to evaluate the efficacy of different devices, then it should clearly reflect in results and conclusion.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Main manuscript- Instead of describing the operative notes in detail, should more focus on how the study was carried and how data was collected. 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.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Title can be revised- Better to describe age group here and Institute name can be omitted here. Discussion - A table can be given - comparing the results of this study with previous similar studies. Fig 1:- Improvement in skills – How it is calculated ?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Name of the Institute can be omitted at certain places.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepak Goyal
Department, University & Country	Department of Pediatrics, Medanta – The Medicity, India