



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_40220
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CARDIOPULMONARY FUNCTIONS IN TRAINED MALE ATHLETES AND SINGERS
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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I have some concerns about the manuscript, which are mentioned in general comments, mainly regarding lack of a structured discussion that supports the results obtained by the authors.	
Minor REVISION comments	1- Abstract part has no problem. However terms such as QRS amplitude and PR could be better clarified.	Done
Optional/General comments	2- The Introduction part is nicely written with clear-cut objectives. 3- The Materials and Methods portion are also fine with well designed methodology. The authors could include the ethical aspects of the research and write the abbreviations of cardiac functions. 4- The Results part is also well written with adequate number of tables. It is important to clarify some abbreviations that appears in the tables which are not previously in the text. Therefore, authors should explain these items before in methods. 5- In Discussion, at first paragraph, authors point out pulmonary function aspects and, in the second paragraph, they show table 2 results. However, I didn't find more discussion. Therefore, the authors must further explore the discussion by pointing out how the study correlates to the literature.	- Thank you Done Done Done