



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. There are too many errors in the grammar; use of spaces, periods, commas, fonts, or formats. The authors should carefully review the manuscript before sending it to a Journal.</p> <p>2. The inclusion or exclusion criteria were not shown clearly.</p> <p>3. What was the definition for statistically significant? Although the authors mentioned $p < 0.05$ was considered as significant in the methods section, $P = 0.05$ was also considered as the “significant” in the results. It indicates that the assessment for the results could be incorrect. Please make sure.</p> <p>4. I don't see any novel or unique finding in this manuscript.</p> <p>5. As mentioned above, there are too many mistakes as a scientific assessment in this manuscript. The investigator should carefully review the protocol.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The inclusion criteria were not shown clearly.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer