

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_104446
Title of the Manuscript:	Does tight mitral stenosis protect the left ventricle? : Strain Vs Simpson Biplan : an echographic study of 50 cases
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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It may be important</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. It may be improved. Many references are more than 5 years older. Please, check again the citation and correct it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It may be an interesting analysis that shows the difference in the left ventricular systolic function assessment between bi-plane method and strain analysis. Technically, manuscript is well written, but So far, it is known that there may be a difference in the systolic function assessment between "classical" bi-plane and strain analysis.</p> <p>Will the use of strain analysis help us in treatment of our patients? What are clinical implications of these finding in patients with MS? Please, specify.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lidija Savic
Department, University & Country	University Clinical Center of Serbia, University of Belgrade, Serbia