



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_CA_12229
Title of the Manuscript:	Changes of pre ejection period and left ventricular ejection time during head up tilt
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>I would like to congratulate the authors for this this very interesting manuscript that eventually could bring some new information to the understanding of the cardiac phisiology. Perhaps some suggestions could add strength to the study.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Do you have any information concerning diastolic parameters as left atrium information, TDI data and a more comprehensive diastolic information using pulsed Doppler? 2- Would that be useful to have data concerning cardiac output analysed at supine, 30 and 60 degree HUT? 3- Do you have any atrain data at at supine, 30 and 60 degree HUT? 4- Also, any 3D echo information? 5- Perhaps some information could be displayed in a different way such as $29 \pm$ 	<p>Thanks a lot for your kindness and appreciate your valuable notes and recommendations.</p> <p>1-This research involved only the systolic function, really we did not involved diastolic information. May be in the future we will study the changes in diastolic parameters.</p> <p>2-A lot of studies studied the changes in stroke volume and cardiac output, in details, at different degrees of HUT,besides the changes of HR &BP.</p> <p>3-I worked under supervision of excellent doctor who had PhD of Cardiovascular physiology from United Kingdom, and he is a very good on echocardiographic examination.</p> <p>4-No 5-Yes, I will do that .</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>5 years, instead of : 29.3 ± 4.7 years; SBP(mmHg) 126 ± 7.7 instead of SBP(mmHg) 126 ± 7.64.</p> <p>6- The study population seems to be very small.</p> <p>7- I believe that a supervision of the English language would help in order to correct typos.</p> <p>8- In the discussion section, a broader analysis of the results could join more integration to physiology and also to different clinical scenarios. Also, other comparisons with different studies (other than Chan's) could reinforce the results.</p> <p>Warmest regards.</p>	<p>6-It was difficult study, measurement of PEP&ET at supine, 30 and 60 degree HUT,after reaching steady state which need time, beside that getting apical view at 60 degree HUT no so easy.</p> <p>7-Yes, Iwill do that.</p> <p>8-Iwill do my best. I have added another reference to support my results. Thanks again for all your efforts.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1- I believe that a supervision of the English language would help in order to correct typos.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-	