



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Annual Research & Review in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | 2013_ARRB_7229 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Initial insight to effect of exercise on maximum pressure in the aortic root using 2D fluid-structure interaction model |

PART 2:

| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any) | Authors' response to final evaluator's comments |
|---|---|
| <p>The authors did a good effort addressing previous suggestions. The general structure improves a bit but results and discussion presentation are still weak. Working hypothesis, primary aim(s)/objective(s) needs to be clearly stated. The authors may explore deeply their results. Slopes and percentages don't tell the full story of your findings. Try further, for example using Bland-Altman plots for comparing methods (consider a reference method). They stated a clear difference between their previous and hardly referred work (ref 27), however almost 2/3 of the presented figures and table are identical. Please do not misunderstand this comment. You should refer to your previous work and avoid using identical figures and tables. An example may be your figure 4 which slightly different from figure 5 in ref 27. Please highlight the new results of this work in comparison with the previous. Discuss how these new findings improve the previous results. In the actual work this remained unclear and it may be important for the readers that follow your work to understand your progress. Author may explore when the model fails (which condition?, are those clinically relevant?, etc...), which clinical situation may benefit of their work, may it complement imaging and/or invasive assessment? How valvular diseases may affect the model? Is model error prediction adequate for clinical use? A good number if clinicians may consider an error of 10% as big.</p> <p>Please consider reviewing again grammar and typing. A good improvement was done in consideration of previous version, but it is still hard to read and typing mistakes lead to distraction.</p> <p>Finally, authors have a good piece of work but results may be used to show the straights of it which is not the case in the actual manuscript. Results may support your working hypothesis which is unclear from the beginning. This was commented in previous review. This reviewer thanks the effort of the authors and hope his suggestions can help them to improve their work.</p> | |

Note: Anonymous Reviewer