

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_92449
Title of the Manuscript:	Alteration of Pulmonary Venous Flow Doppler Post Transcatheter Closure of Atrial Septal Defect
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:

(<https://www.journalca.com/index.php/CA/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>I read the article entitle as "Alteration of Pulmonary Venous Flow Doppler Post Transcatheter Closure of Atrial Septal Defect". However I have some major remarks. You can find that with details;</p> <p>Introduction: What is the scientific basis of the study? Where is the background literature? Did the authors search associated literature? What is the main aim of the study? The introduction section of the study had not formal infrastructure.</p> <p>Material and Methods: What are the inclusion (and also exclusion) criteria? How did the authors calculate sample size? Did the authors consider temporal effects of the closure (particularly for post-procedural assessment) Did the authors calculate inter- and intra-observer variability? Did the authors consider type of the closure devices? How did the authors exclude effects of potential confounders? (Sedation type, patient age, pulmonary artery pressure and other haemodynamic etc.)</p> <p>By use of an unpaired T test, the authors compared changes in pulmonary venous flow patterns between pre- and post-closure. However, in pre- and post-procedure (treatment) studies, mixed effects models such as ANCOVA are required because they are more precise than the unpaired T test, correct for baseline imbalances that predispose to regression to the mean, and offer increased statistical power to detect small differences.</p> <p>Results: Needs to fix grammar mistakes and revision according to the context.</p> <p>Discussion: Needs to fix grammar mistakes and revision according to the context and related literature.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Ugur Onsel Turk
Department, University & Country	Izmir Economy University, School of Medicine, Türkiye