

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_95611
Title of the Manuscript:	Left Ventricular Geometry and Function in Patients with Gray Zone Hypertension
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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. This manuscript is important because it discusses Left Ventricular Geometry and Function in Patients with Gray Zone Hypertension. It is important to emphasize that gray zone hypertension affects diastolic function and left ventricular geometry. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract of the article is sufficient. 4. The subsections and structure of the article are appropriate. 5. I think it does not contradict current scientific findings. 6. References are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is sufficient for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments	Since your manuscript is a useful study for the scientific community, it would be even more helpful if you could briefly mention the treatment.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasan Ekim
Department, University & Country	Bozok University, Türkiye