

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_115667
Title of the Manuscript:	PATENT FORAMEN OVALE (PFO) IN PATIENTS OF CRYPTOGENIC STROKE AND TRANSIENT ISCHEMIC ATTACK (TIA)- A REAL WORLD EXPERIENCE.
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript investigating the prevalence of patent foramen ovale (PFO) in patients with cryptogenic stroke and transient ischemic attack (TIA) in North India may not be considered critically important for the scientific community due to several factors. Its limited scope, focusing on a specific region and a small sample size, restricts the generalizability of findings. The lack of statistical significance in the association between PFO and cryptogenic stroke/TIA, along with methodological limitations such as potential biases and exclusion criteria, undermines the reliability and broader applicability of the results. Without clear clinical implications or significant contributions to existing knowledge beyond negative findings, the manuscript's impact on guiding patient care or advancing stroke research remains uncertain.</p> <p>2. The title of the article, "PATENT FORAMEN OVALE (PFO) IN PATIENTS OF CRYPTOGENIC STROKE AND TRANSIENT ISCHEMIC ATTACK (TIA)- A REAL WORLD EXPERIENCE," may not be entirely suitable as it lacks specificity and does not clearly convey the key findings or contributions of the study. While it mentions PFO in relation to cryptogenic stroke and TIA, it could benefit from a more descriptive and informative title that highlights the study's methodology, population characteristics, and main results. A more precise title could improve the article's visibility and relevance to readers interested in this specific topic within stroke research.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article may not be comprehensive enough as it provides a general overview of the study without delving into specific details such as the methodology, results, and implications in sufficient depth. While it briefly mentions the study's objectives, methods, key findings (e.g., PFO prevalence), and a conclusion regarding the association between stroke type and PFO presence, it lacks specific numerical data or statistical significance measures that would enhance the reader's understanding of the study's significance and implications. A more detailed abstract with specific results and statistical significance would improve its comprehensiveness and value to readers seeking a quick summary of the study.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript may not be entirely appropriate as they lack clear delineation and organization, making it challenging for readers to navigate through the content seamlessly. While the manuscript includes sections such as Background, Objective, Methods & Results, Conclusion, and References, the transitions between these sections could be smoother, and the information within each section could be better organized and presented. For instance, the Methods & Results section could be further subdivided into subsections like Study Population, Study Design, Statistical Analysis, and Key Findings to improve clarity and readability. Additionally, the inclusion of figures, tables, or charts within appropriate sections could enhance the manuscript's structure and visual presentation of data.</p> <p>5. Based on the information provided, there are concerns about the scientific correctness of the manuscript. The study's methodology, including the sample size of 25 participants and potential biases from exclusion criteria, raises questions about the reliability and generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the lack of statistical significance in the association between patent foramen ovale (PFO) and cryptogenic stroke/Transient Ischemic Attack (TIA) suggests that the study may not have adequately addressed confounding variables or other factors that could influence the results. Without further clarification or discussion of these issues, the scientific correctness of the manuscript remains uncertain.</p> <p>6. The references provided in the manuscript may not be sufficient and sufficiently recent to support the study's claims and findings. While the references cover some key studies related to patent foramen ovale (PFO) and cryptogenic stroke/TIA, there may be a lack of</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript investigating the prevalence of patent foramen ovale (PFO) in patients with cryptogenic stroke and transient ischemic attack (TIA) in North India. We appreciate your feedback and would like to address your concerns regarding the importance and scope of our study.</p> <p>While we understand your points regarding the limited scope of our study focusing on a specific region and a relatively small sample size, we believe that our findings still hold value in contributing to the existing literature on this topic. Our study provides valuable insights into the prevalence of PFO in a specific population, which can be beneficial for researchers and clinicians working in similar settings.</p> <p>Regarding the lack of statistical significance in the association between PFO and cryptogenic stroke/TIA, we acknowledge this limitation. However, negative findings also play a crucial role in research by highlighting areas that require further investigation or potential avenues for future studies. We believe that our study adds to the overall body of knowledge on PFO and stroke. Regarding methodological limitations such as potential biases and exclusion criteria, we have taken steps to address these issues in our study design and analysis. We have provided a detailed discussion of these limitations in our manuscript to ensure transparency and help readers interpret the results appropriately.</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the title of our article, "PATENT FORAMEN OVALE (PFO) IN PATIENTS OF CRYPTOGENIC STROKE AND TRANSIENT ISCHEMIC ATTACK (TIA)- A REAL WORLD EXPERIENCE." we understand your concern about the title's specificity and clarity. While we recognize the importance of a descriptive and informative title, we would like to maintain the current title as it reflects the real-world experience aspect of our study and its relevance to clinical practice. Regarding the abstract, we acknowledge your suggestion for a more comprehensive summary. However, we believe that the current abstract provides a suitable overview of the study's objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusions within the given space limitations. Regarding the subsections and structure of the manuscript, we</p>

Review Form 1.7

	recent literature or a broader range of studies that could strengthen the manuscript's scientific foundation. It would be beneficial to include more recent references (within the past 5-10 years) that discuss advancements in PFO detection, stroke etiology, or related diagnostic and treatment modalities. Additionally, referencing studies specific to the Indian population or addressing regional variations in stroke epidemiology could enhance the manuscript's relevance and credibility.	appreciate your suggestions for clearer delineation and organization. However, we have chosen to maintain the current structure as we believe it effectively presents our research methodology, results, and conclusions in a coherent manner. We have corrected the refrence as suggested thank you.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article may not be suitable for scholarly communications due to several grammatical issues, lack of clarity in sentence structure, and occasional inconsistencies in terminology and phrasing. These language issues can detract from the readability and professional presentation of the manuscript, potentially hindering its acceptance and understanding by the scholarly community. A thorough proofreading and editing process focusing on grammar, syntax, and consistency in language usage would be necessary to enhance the article's suitability for scholarly communication.	Thank you for your feedback regarding the language and English quality of our article. We have carefully reviewed the manuscript and addressed the grammatical issues, lack of clarity in sentence structure, and inconsistencies in terminology and phrasing that you mentioned. Our team conducted a thorough proofreading and editing process to ensure that the language of the manuscript meets the standards expected for scholarly communications. Thank you.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	NONE