

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_106023
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Left Ventricular Diastolic Function and Time to Reperfusion by Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in ST Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction Patients
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It may be, but it must be improved (see comments below)</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. They must be improved</p> <p>5. It must be improved.</p> <p>6. Out of 26 references, about 20 are more than 5 years old.</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>The Introduction section should be shortened, especially first part- incidence and definition of myocardial infarction. The study is about diastolic dysfunction and primary PCI and this should be in the focus.</p> <p>In the Methodology section: please state how the diastolic function was analyzed/determined, which clinical variables were included in analysis, how the primary PCI was performed.....</p> <p>Results: Table 2- If authors suggest that cholesterol and CK values did not have correlation with diastolic dysfunction, why did they include these variables in the table? Did authors analyze kidney function and diastolic dysfunction? What about some angiographic characteristics (such as number of vessels with significant stenosis, post-procedural TIMI flow....)?</p> <p>Echocardiographic parameters such as E/A, e', LA volume, etc are used for determining diastolic dysfunction and their values in different grades of diastolic dysfunction are well known. So I don't think that these parameters should be included in the logistic regression analysis. I will suggest including clinical variables, laboratory, some angiographic variables, TIMI flow, and time to reperfusion in the logistic regression model for determining predictors of diastolic dysfunction. Authors should use statistical methods to determine cut off value for time to reperfusion which is significantly correlated with diastolic dysfunction in their patients.</p> <p>In the Discussion section: first part - the results are from this manuscript or from study by Chen et al (ref. 21)? I think that authors should discuss their findings first and then make a comparison with other studies. Authors mentioned two times study by Shacham et al (ref. number 22) and findings.... "time to reperfusion 185 minutes...." there is no need to repeat this finding. Please re-check the number of references cited in the text- Shacham et al. is number 22 and not 24!</p> <p>Explain your findings- how can you explain that reperfusion time is correlated with diastolic</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	dysfunction? Where is the conclusion section in the manuscript?	
--	--	--

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:	Lidija Savic
Department, University & Country	University Clinical Center of Serbia, University of Belgrade, Serbia