

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_83929
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical study of 135 cases of Kawasaki disease
Type of the Article	Retrospective Study

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:

(<https://www.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Keywords chosen should include Kawasaki disease or mucacutaneous lymph node syndrome (more commonly used in of search query)</p> <p>In the abstract, the author described the method and result, which both were not written nor described throughout the length of the script. Method and ethical clearance should be mentioned, with results from 135 cases reported and narrated. Tables, charts or images from diagnostic imaging should be accordingly used to properly outline the results.</p> <p>Statistical analysis should be used when proper to give more robust analysis.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Page 3 Line 29 ("The onset age of iKD children is younger...") and 31 ("A number of studies have analyzed...."), the sentence bore repetition, the author should summarize both in one sentence.</p> <p>Discussion should be based on the data the authors obtained from the retrospective study, then discussed accordingly with selected references.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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:	Oktavia Lilyasari
Department, University & Country	Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia