



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_CA_8482
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of arterial pulse amplitude ratio and Valsalva ratio in different age groups

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The basic idea is good, but there are many formal, stylistic, grammatical errors and ambiguities in the text (line 55 - Hébert1 et al [7] measured the pulse amplitude ratio). In the title of article, authors use index or number: Yesar MH AL-Shamma^{11*}, Amir S AL-Mu'min^{22*}, Ahlam KA AL-Hamdany^{33*}. 1.PhD physiology(UK). Department of physiology ,college of medicine, Kufa university. 2.Interventional cardiology ,F.I.C.M.S. Department of Medicine, college of medicine, Babylon university. 3.PhD physiology. Department of physiology ,college of medicine, Babylon university The names of the workplace are written by capital letter. Too long sentences eliminate the idea so the essence of article escapes (line 66-70). References unite! Beginning of the sentence always starts with a capital letter. Errors in the interpretation of the result. For example: Line 125 – 128: The systolic and diastolic blood pressure of G2 were significantly higher than values of systolic and diastolic blood pressure of G1 at phaseI and phaseII of VM ($P=0.05$), but There were no significant differences between pulse pressure at phaseI and phaseII of VM of the two groups ($P>0.05$), and there were no significant differences between pulse amplitude ratio and Valsalva ratio of both groups ($P>0.05$). The systolic and diastolic blood pressure of G2 were significantly higher than values of systolic and diastolic blood pressure of G1 at phaseI and phaseII of VM ($P<0.05$), but there were no significant differences between pulse pressure at phaseI and phaseII of VM of the two groups ($P<0.05$), and there were no significant differences between pulse amplitude ratio and Valsalva ratio of both groups ($P<0.05$). In the chapter about the statistical analysis, authors write “P-value <0.05 considered statistically significant” Next example in table: Comparison between Valsalva ratio and pulse amplitude ratio of G1 and G2.(G1:group1(28.3±9.7)years old,G2:group2(48.4±7.1)years old. $P>0.05$. May be: Comparison Valsalva ratio and pulse amplitude ratio between G1 and G2. (G1:group1(28.3±9.7)years old,G2:group2(48.4±7.1)years old. $P<0.05$.	At first i want to express my deepest thanks and appreciation to your valuable advice and guidance. I arranged the authors names and affiliations according to instructions in the SDI paper template which was sent to me : Author 1^{1*}, Author 2^{2*}...(Type the Author(s)'s Name Here) (Put * above the corresponding author and give telephone number, fax number and email ID in the footer) ¹Type the Affiliation with address here ²Type the Affiliation with address here So i only followed the instructions of the journal. -Yes, i will rewrite the work place in capital letters. -I think you mean line 68-72 : actually i intended to illustrate the aim of the study in details as the reviewers mentioned that the introduction not showed the aim and benefit of the study clearly . I rewrite his sentence. -Yes, for the references i will revise them again to be exactly according to your instructions. -Previously before revision of manuscript, I expressed p value as $p<0.05$ if there was statistical significance difference, but i change it to $p=0.05$, according to the instruction of SDI paper template that was sent to me which said: <u>Guideline for Reporting P values:</u> <u>P is always italicized and capitalized.</u> <u>i) Correct expression: ($P = .05$). Wrong Expression: ($P < .05$), unless $P < .001$.</u> -For p value expression : We had studied biostatistics in the courses of PhD- Physiology, when the sample t value exceed the tabulated value this mean there is significant difference which is unlikely due to chance, p value expressed as $p<0.05$, but if the sample t value less than tabulated t value, this mean that there is no significant difference ,and the difference is likely due to chance ,so p expressed as $p>0.05$. So as there were no significant differences between pulse amplitude ratio and Valsalva ratio of both groups ,p value expressed as $p>0.05$. -I made all other suggestions (highlighted with yellow color)



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1