

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_95546</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A clinical analysis of Phlebolympheidema and its relationship with physical activity and disability</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The authors present their experience with regard to a relatively new concept, the phelebolympheidema. My comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Background, 2. Paragraph: 'Clinical guidelines of Mexican public health services barely suggest lymphedema management but is only mentioned in the context of breast cancer processes'.. I think it's not logical to discuss lymphedema secondary to breast cancer. The concept, etiology, etc.. are completely different in lymphedema related to breast surgery and radical lymph node dissection. Please revise your statement.</li> <li>- Please combine introduction, background and objective headings, there's no need to discuss them separately. All the information here may be given in introduction section.</li> <li>- Could the authors define 'Phlebolympheidema' exactly somewhere in the text? How do they combine scientific parameters for diagnosis of CVI and lymphedema? And the definition of anatomical location.. legs, upper extremity or both?</li> <li>- Please revisit the author guidelines for references.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arda Özyüksel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Biruni University, Türkiye</b>