Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Pediatric Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPR_109997**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Assessment of Auditory Brainstem Response in Infants Suffering from Congenital Heart Disease**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

	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 1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. Yes. It describes the assessment of hearing function of paediatric patients with congenital heart disease. Many similar studies found but it might be useful for regional use. 2. I suggest to not use the term infants, since you compare < 12 and > 12 months age group. Infant is defined as a baby from 0-12 months old (not > 12 months). Find a more suitable terms. 3. Overall, the grammar needs to be reviewed and corrected. The aim of the study needs to be stressed more. Need to explore the method more, about the assessment of CHD and ABR, and the choices of dividing each subject into groups. The conclusion needs to answer the aim of the study and reflect the overall research, not just a suggestion or theory. 4. There are a lot that can be improved. Please provide the aim of the study in the background/introduction. In methods, please give a thorough details, the inclusion and the exclusion criteria; the division of groups; and what parameter do you want to analyse (suddenly a lot of parameter appears in the discussion). In statistical analysis session, please state which parameter is analysed with which test. In results, it is better to present it in the table (not in form of diagram). Present the demographic data first (you could analyse it whether it had normal distribution or not). And then divide the subjects into groups as stated in methods, and compare them. Particularly regarding furosemide, is it counted as ototoxic drugs? Does not it need to be excluded? If not, please write possible bias for the study. Describe the SpO_2, Hb level and other things you want to analyse further in the results (and methods). In the discussions, a lot of things "suddenly" shows up. You need to "introduce them" in methods and results. Please write the possible limitations of the study and the suggestion for further research. 5. Since it is a cross sectional study, no causality could be concluded in this study. The analysis should be more thorough to get the best of the data here. 6. If possible use the latest reference. More than half of your references is older than 5 years.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Please consider in taking assistance in reviewing grammar for academic purposes.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Hardian Gunardi**
Department, University & Country	**University of Indonesia, Indonesia**