

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>	

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.	
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.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fuat Polat
Department, University & Country	Dr. Siyami Ersek Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery Education Research Hospital, Turkey