

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_116533</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Subclinical Left Ventricular Dysfunction in Asymptomatic Type Two Diabetes Mellitus Patients with an Echocardiographic Study</b>
Type of the 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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>2. <b>No, a more comprehensive and understandable title should be chosen</b></p> <p>3. <b>No, There is confusion in terms and abbreviations</b></p> <p>4. <b>In the material and method section, "the following measurements were obtained in each region as: myocardial systolic (S m) wave, myocardial early diastolic wave (Em) and atrial peak velocity (Am), Em/Am ratio" abbreviations were used, followed by an E/e. Is there an abbreviation???. This has been repeated in the tables as well, I think these confusions will make it very difficult for the reader to understand the article.</b></p> <p>5. <b>For conventional tissue doppler measurements and the abbreviations used in this field, you can benefit from the following articles.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Selvester score and myocardial performance index in acute anterior myocardial infarction. Revista da Associação Médica Brasileira, 69, 325-329.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Comparative assessment of the effects of dobutamine and levosimendan on right ventricular ejection fraction in patients with biventricular heart failure. Kardiologia, 63(2), 46-51.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Does the Modified Glasgow Prognostic Score be a Predictive Parameter for Right Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction in Patients with Acute Decompensated Heart Failure?.</b></li> </ol>	
<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>	<p>The subject of the study is interesting, but the number of patients is quite small, however, I think the number of patients could have been increased in this area. The material method of the study should be reviewed from beginning to end, attention should be paid to abbreviations, tissue doppler and conventional doppler measurements and abbreviations should be explained clearly and this confusion should be evident in the summary of the article. I think the suggested articles will be useful in this regard.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mustafa Kaplangoray</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bilecik Şehy Edebali University, Turkey</b>