

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_96005
Title of the Manuscript:	DIFFERENCES IN CARDIOVASCULAR REMODELING IN KIDNEY TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS AND PERITONEAL DIALYSIS PATIENTS
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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>PERFECT YES</p> <p>YES</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>ARTICLE IS WELL WRITTEN AND GOOD .</p> <p>1 -Avoid words ' SYSTOLIC WEAKNESS write in terms of DYSFUNCTION '</p> <p>2 -When ever you mention improvement in DIASTOLIC DYSFUNCTION Better to Mention comparative results in terms of grade of diastolic dysfunction or in other words in terms of LVEDP</p> <p>3 Avoid short forms .</p> <p>Other wise great work</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajeev Srivastava
Department, University & Country	Venkateshwar Hospital, India