

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_94656</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Is portable cardiopulmonary ultrasound the future of heart failure diagnosis?</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Reviewer's General Comments:</b> 1. The manuscript is sufficiently robust, technically sound, interesting and will gain a large number of readers</p> <p><b>Reviewer's General Introduction:</b> 1. In the Introduction topic, I suggest contextualizing with current references the importance of evaluating the B and NT line in the context of your work</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments for Methodology:</b> 1. The methodology topic lacks ethical considerations, how the research group (sample) was chosen, inclusion and exclusion criteria, further detailing the methodology, study period, location, sample profile, statistics used, stages of follow-up of the studied groups , include in the first citation in the work the meaning of all cited acronyms such as FEVE, NT, AE, NYHA, BNP</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments for Discussion:</b> 1. References are relevant and current 2. The facts and figures are real</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments for Results:</b> 1. In the topic results specify and emphasize significant results considering the p-value</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments for Conclusion:</b> 1. The conclusion is supported by the manuscript data.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jamille Silva Nogueira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>State University of Campinas, Brazil</b>