

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_90012
Title of the Manuscript:	Association between CHA2DS2-VASc Score and Right Ventricular Dysfunction in Patients with Acute Pulmonary Embolism
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Dear Editor, Thank you for giving me the opportunity to read the article. Overall, it's a well-written article, but I found some shortcomings.</p> <p>1- Abstract: The author has used too many abbreviations here. Since some of them do not have a clear version, they may not find the explanation of the abbreviation until the introduction and material method of the article. This situation affects the understanding of the abstract part. Abbreviations should be avoided in the abstract. Also, instead of p value, it should be written as example p=0.02. Abbreviations should not be used in the conclusion.</p> <p>2- There are many abbreviations in the introduction.</p> <p>3- Material and method: The authors should clearly explain the start and end date of the study. The reasons in the exclusion criteria should explain why they were excluded.</p> <p>4- The percentages in the table should be given together at the top (n%). Then the % sign in parentheses should be removed. Abbreviations should be explained under all tables and the name of the statistics used should be given.</p> <p>5- The number of both tables and figures is too many, the number of tables should be limited to 5-6 and the number of figures to 1-2.</p> <p>6- References should be written in a uniform, DOI or PMID should be given instead of links if necessary.</p> <p>Kind regards.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Major Revision	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abuzer Coskun
Department, University & Country	Bağcılar Training and Research Hospital, Turkey