Book Name:	[Current Approaches in Engineering Research and Technology](#)
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BPR_3276**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Continuous Wavelet Transform based Phonocardiogram Delineation Method**
Type of the Article	**Book chapter**

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The proposed topic in the manuscript is very important because it touches on a sensitive organ in the human being, through which many diseases can be detected, and thus allows for rapid intervention and avoidance of heart disease abnormalities. However, I think that the manuscript is poor from a literary perspective, especially in the introduction, as it did not mention previous works in a solid manner, since the author focused on old references. It also needs, from a scientific perspective, some mathematical formulas and physical indications, such as how to calculate Se, more details to explain CWT, and the shape of the used mother wavelet etc...**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Not recommended.** **My suggestion is: Phonocardiogram Signal delineation Using Continuous Wavelet Transform**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**The abstract is not coherent; it seems to contain a single idea, but it is muddled. For example, it starts with the idea of time-frequency for event detection in audio signals in general, then mentions the loudness function, and afterward talks about the phonocardiogram signal. It would have been better to mention the application of this technique directly to the phonocardiogram signal, followed by the wavelet transform as a case study among time-frequency techniques.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The manuscript is scientifically sound but not strong as it requires scientific strength. The idea seems to be there but is not presented convincingly and diversely.** **The section on pre-processing needs more details and clarification, as well as regarding the CWT technique.** **The discussion section needs further clarification.** **The manuscript needs a scientific and technical diagram to summarize the stages of the used technology.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**The references are sufficient in number but not sufficient in terms of content because most of them are old. Among them, the author mentioned 3 references from 2020 to 2022. I suggest various references that dealt with the PCG signal using artificial intelligence, machine learning, EMD, SWT…**	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The approach used in the language by the author is suitable for scholarly communications, but it is not of high quality because it lacks professional scientific sentences.	
Optional/General comments	**In the abstract: the abbreviation "PCG" is mentioned in the seventh line without first explaining its meaning in the fourth line.** **The frequent use of the phrase "the same" in the summary gives the impression that the author is throwing out ideas without clear specifications rephrase the meaning in a professional manner** - Words must be unified, for example, using either phonocardiogram or PCG cardiac signal throughout the manuscript. - Avoid explaining the meaning of the stemoscope in the abstract, but rather explain it in detail in its own section. **In the preprocessing section, the meaning of the acronym ACF is not mentioned I n the fourteenth line.** - References are not in sequence in the manuscript. - The images are very blurry. Do not take a screenshot or use the plotter, but load the images directly from MATLAB as that is available. - After mentioning the scientific translation for the first time, the abbreviation must be mentioned immediately after it, then we use that abbreviation throughout the manuscript, for example in section **PCG Analysis using Metrics** on the fourth line, insert after say The Signal to Noise Ratio its abbreviation SNR. Apply the same note throughout the manuscript **What do you mean by TP, FP and FN: identify them in the text or in the table 3?** Re-Table 5, by putting each AC, Se, P+, S1, and S2 in its own column.	

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:	**Anissa khiter**
Department, University & Country	**University of Djelfa, Algeria**