

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_95235
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Left Ventricular Diastolic Dysfunction in Cases with Liver Cirrhosis
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes. (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? Yes (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Improvements are necessary. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Not really. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Improvements are necessary. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Dear Editor,</p> <p>The manuscript entitled: ``Assessment of Left Ventricular Diastolic Dysfunction in Cases with Liver Cirrhosis`` is a small original study. There are some important (major) issues related to the conceptualization of this study.</p> <p>Major revision</p> <p>Exclusion criteria must include also patients with diabetes mellitus, arterial hypertension, etc because there are many pathologies that modify left ventricular diastolic function.</p> <p>In methodology there are not sufficiently/optimally explain echocardiographic methods. For example: `` LA was evaluated.`` How was assessed (what size method, what functions were assessed)? In addition, all other echos, except two-dimensional speckle tracking, are not sufficiently detailed.</p> <p>`` Ejection fraction (EF) and fractional shortening (FS) were computed using 2D guided M mode echocardiographic tracings in the parasternal long axis view using the Teichholz formula.`` This is not the recommended method by the actual echocardiographic guidelines (not anymore) for left ventricular ejection fraction.</p> <p>For diastolic function, current echo guidelines was used? This is very important. Otherwise, all this study has a wrong methodology.</p> <p>Page 6: ``... origin of cirrhosis...`` is somewhat abnormal. Probably the authors would like saying etiology of cirrhosis.</p> <p>LAVi (as LA dilatation parameter) is a sign of chronic diastolic dysfunction. What was the anciently of cirrhosis diagnostic in these patients? It is not sufficiently to make this correlation without other data about these pathologies (cirrhosis and left ventricular diastolic dysfunction).</p> <p>What about pulmonary hypertension in these patients? In cirrhosis is known to be present pulmonary hypertension. In diastolic dysfunction algorithm, tricuspid insufficiency velocity is present as parameter of this.</p> <p>Figure 2 (B): the measurements are not accurate because velocity scale is not adjusted. What about interoperator variability measurements?</p> <p>Entire methodology of diastolic dysfunction is abnormal in this study.</p> <p>Limitations study are very poor, as discussions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Minor revision</p> <p>Please explain all acronyms at first utilization (ex page 4: ``.. scoring method by replacing PT for clinical nutrition status``).</p> <p>The references are differently inserted in the manuscript (the first versus the last part of the manuscript). Please verify.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Major improvements are necessary for this manuscript (the methodology is not appropriately detailed).</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:	Floria Mariana
Department, University & Country	Grigore t. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania