

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>The topic is important issue discussion for scientific community. Mitral stenosis is an ongoing disease in development countries.</p> <p>The title is appropriate brings the curiosity of the reader and is consistent with the study proposal</p> <p>The abstract of the article is well written, easy to read and clearly brings the objective and results of the study.</p> <p>The manuscript is well structured and its subtitles are in accordance with the rules of the journal.</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the section "materials and methods": the authors forget to describe the data collection, there is no mention of how many cases were not eligible by the study criteria. There is no description of the exclusion criteria for the other heart diseases. Also, in this same section in line 6 the authors mention that atrial fibrillation was excluded, but we do not know how the exclusion criteria were and the type of AF.</p> <p>in the section "statistical study" the authors only mentioned the frequency of descriptive variable. None of statistics are describe. The study design is not aligned with the proposed outcome.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) There is no information on the consent form for the use of data from the institution and patients</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ricardo Casalino Sanches De Moraes
Department, University & Country	University of São Paulo, Brazil