



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_33619
Title of the Manuscript:	DIFFERENTIATION OF HEMODYNAMICS OF TOP ATHLETES DEPENDING ON HEART RATE VARIABILITY AFTER TRAINING
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>)

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	The manuscript provides an interesting idea and relevant information, but could be reorganized accordingly. I suggest to restructure the paper before another review. Abstract: please provide more details of methodology; Section 2, please change for a more concise title; Please, extend section 2 and provide more details of methods; Results: Table 2, 3,4,5,6,7,8,9 and10: add a legend for abbrev. below each table; There are much more results than discussion;	Thank you for your feedbacks. We considered them. Abstract: We provided more details about methodology. The methodology of our research is provided with more details at the beginning of the third section. Results: We added all missing legends for abbreviations that were used in the tables. However, to our mind there is no sense to add existing legends before each table twice. .We took your feedback into consideration and added additional discussions in our results and discussion section
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comment		