

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79180
Title of the Manuscript:	Mitral Annular Plane Systolic Excursion (MAPSE) As A Simple Index For Assessing Left Ventricular Function: An observational study
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

		<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Authors said            What this study adds?:MAPSE measures left ventricular ejection fraction in conditions with poor image quality            → In Materials And Method, authors also mentioned "Patients with poor acoustic windows and diastolic dysfunction were excluded from the study."            It seems that you make a contradictory statement</p> <p>-MAPSE measurement is applicable in assessing left ventricular ejection fraction across various clinical conditions            →What is "various clinical conditions" means? It is vague expression.            I think at least "calcification" and "renal dysfunction" should include in "various clinical conditions".            Discussion: Our study showed a positive correlation between MAPSE and EF derived from Modified Simpsons' method.            →In Results,:There was no significant correlation between EF Simpson with MAPSE- S and L in group A. You should write presupposition.</p> <p>Table 3:In Group B, all <math>r^2</math> are under 0.6. In couple with Figure 2(ROC curve),is it really significant?</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Materials And Method / Table1:            You should write "co-morbidities" in detail.            You should write exclusion criteria in text.</p> <p>What is the difference between MAPSE (in other studies), MAPSE-S and MAPSE-L in this study? Why you use this two indicators?</p> <p>Why you only include normal sinus rhythm patients?            MAPSE has been reported to be functionally effective in assessing LV systolic function in patients with atrial fibrillation.</p> <p>Table3: Please add "AUC" in this table.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Karin Kato</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kyoto University Hospital, Japan</b>