

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_95546
Title of the Manuscript:	A clinical analysis of Phlebolympheidema and its relationship with physical activity and disability
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- Moderate importance 2- Yes 3- Yes 4- Need more modification. 5- Yes but need modifications. 6- Yes Additional Comments:- A- Does this study have legal approvals to conduct the survey? It must be mentioned. B- For the manuscript to be eligible for publication, the manuscript needs to be modified with additional information. C- Where is the literature review (previous study)? D- What new subject will get in this investigation? Alternatively, what is the new result as compared with the previous study? E- The conclusion section needs more modification.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali A. Al-Allaq
Department, University & Country	Iraq