

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_127241
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF RIGHT VENTRICULAR STRAIN IN HEART FAILURE WITH PRESERVED EJECTION FRACTION
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The RV function in HFpEF has a critical role in patient symptom, quality of life and outcome. Today multimodality approach with combination of echocardiography and CMR improved RV function determination. Trans thoracic echocardiography as a simple, available and cost-effective tool has important role in diagnosis ZRV function. In addition new software such as Tom Tec can determines RV function in echocardiography as well as MRI if patient has enough image quality. In follow up of patients with treated HFpEF with weight reduction or other intervention determining RV function and sPAP are crucial. Old method such as TAPCE or RV TDI hasn't have enough accuracy and RV strain is best diagnostic and prognostic tool for evaluation RV function in all patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There is some problem. For example it's not any explanation about Figure 5 and 6 in text of manuscript, in addition it seems that these figurers are part of other article that copy without any change, The permission from original article author is in doubt . The tables is not in English language in addition there is not enough explanation for abbreviations in tables.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Although this topic is almost an attractive topic in Heart failure era but the manuscript methodology has low quality, There is number of ambiguities in study method. For example how much patient is denovo HF and how much are chronic HFpEF, also about previous and current medical treatment and clinical condition before hospitalization such as rhythm disturbances, valvular heart disease, cardiomyopathies such as restrictive or hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, renal failure and coronary artery disease. It's better to put patients with HFpEF and cardiomyopathies, significant VHD or significant CAD in exclusion criteria due to different course of disease . Risk factor, clinical feature and details of echocardiographic data in patients who was died due to HFpEF during study not reported in the manuscript and only echocardiograpy RV result has been reported. (LV failure, RV failure or both clinical feature, denovo HF or chronic, other medical condition,...). There is scientific mistake in explaining the RV strain, in part 2.1. Clinical and paraclinical evaluation criteria, RV strain measurement in 4c view in echocardiography determined longitudinal strain and function not radial function. The vendor of echocardiography and software and method for measurement RV strain are not available in the manuscript. The method for determining LVEF didn't explain in the manuscript too(2D, 3D, Simpson or other)	

Review Form 3

	The study design has ambiguity too. In the manuscript the type of study was prospective cohort but in the text of manuscript has been written that records data from registry was applied.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	There is no references for normal strain value in the manuscript(global and segmental). Numbers of paragraph in discussion part has no references. About outcome in HFpEF, there are several studies that confirm that some intervention such as weight reduction , HTN treatment, Exercise and change in life style in addition to some drugs such as Finerenone maybe improved outcome in HFpEF, in opposite of this manuscript that say there is no treatment for improving outcome in HFpEF. The author can study these article: Finerenone improved outcomes in HFmrEF and HFpEF(Irene Fernandez-Ruiz) September 2024, Nature	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, tables are not in English language(It seems the tables are in Frech language)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
	Some part of the text has not enough english quality for communication due to inappropriate terms, such as term median for introducing mid part of RV free wall.	

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:	Nasrin Ghadakkar
Department, University & Country	Iran