

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_CA_126342 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Left Ventricular Ultrasound Diastolic Parameters in Postmenopausal Breast Cancer Patients Treated with Adjuvant Anthracycline and Trastuzumab |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The author evaluate changes in left ventricular (LV) ultrasound parameters, including diastolic parameters, in postmenopausal women with breast cancer (BC), as a high-risk group receiving anthracycline-trastuzumab-containing regimens. | We are so grateful for your positive review. |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | Suitable |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes | We are so grateful for your positive review. |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | Yes, it is. |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Yes it is scientifically correct. | We are so grateful for your positive review. |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes | Yes, they are |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It is not a research article, It is meta-analysis or literature review. PRISMA should be included accordingly.2. Author has abbreviated breast cancer as (BC), but still throughout the manuscript full form is used correct that.3. From December 2019 to March 2024 at the ultrasound laboratory of Tbilisi State University Medical Center, mention the city and country as well in this4. The author has to add about regression analysis, and survival analysis tools (Kaplan-Meier crves and Cox proportional model) in the introduction part as well and cite them accordingly.5. Add few article for citations https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9783527841165.ch36. The Figure 2 is not mentioned in the text add it accordingly.7. Rewrite the conclusion with significant outcome of the study.8. Make a table of abbreviations. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It is a research article (original research). It has not to do with a meta-analysis or literature review. Please check the sectionl: Methods, Results2. We corrected it3. We corrected it4. The regression analysis and survival analysis methods, including Kaplan-Meier curves and the Cox proportional hazards model, are detailed in the 'Materials and Methods' section. As these are statistical tools, they are not cited or discussed in the Introduction.5. Adding new literature is laborious and will take a lot of time, especially since I already have all the necessary literature. The time is crucial for me (I have to publish as soon as possible). I will take it into account in other publications6. We corrected it7. We corrected it (Due to the limitation of the number of words, we had shortened it in the abstract. Now we rewrite it8. We corrected it |
| Optional/General comments | | <ol style="list-style-type: none">9. The submitted list of references includes one of our publications, originally marked as 'in press' (Reference N13), which is now available on PubMed. I have updated it accordingly.10. Thank you for your time and cooperation. We hope our submission will be published soon. |

PART 2:

| | 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> |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | The study was approved by the Ethical Commission of the Faculty of Medicine of TSU. All patients provided written informed consent |