



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_CA_8482
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of arterial pulse amplitude ratio and Valsalva ratio in different age groups
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The paper is poorly written. Extensive grammar errors existed which makes this paper difficult to read. 2. The paper adds little knowledge to the field. 3. The hypothesis and main conclusion of this paper are unclear. It is hard to catch what issue that the authors are trying to address.	Thanks a lot for your scientific notes, i worked hardly to improve the manuscript, nearly i rewrite the manuscript to be more organised. Yes I rewrite the aim and conclusion of this study to be more informative.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The sample size is too small.	Yes, but i read many studies in the same field with a smaller sample size.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		