

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>

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.	This manuscript provides valuable insight into the effects of adjuvant anthracycline-trastuzumab treatment on left ventricular (LV) diastolic parameters in postmenopausal breast cancer patients, a high-risk group for cardiotoxicity. By assessing the predictive value of specific diastolic parameters, it highlights critical considerations for cardio-oncology in resource-limited settings where advanced echocardiography might not be readily available. This research contributes to ongoing discussions on cardioprotective strategies, making it a noteworthy addition to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the study's focus on LV diastolic parameters in a specific patient group receiving anthracycline-trastuzumab treatment. It effectively communicates the scope and relevance of the research, so no changes are necessary.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and covers essential aspects such as the aim, methodology, key results, and conclusions. However, it would benefit from including a brief mention of the sample size and specific diagnostic methods used (e.g., Kaplan-Meier curves, Cox model) to enhance clarity for the reader.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized, with distinct sections that allow for a logical progression of ideas and findings. Each part, including Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion, is appropriately structured for a research paper, contributing to the scientific rigor of the study.	
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.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust, with a well-defined cohort and use of relevant statistical analyses, including multiple regression and survival analysis, to determine associations between LV diastolic parameters and cardiotoxicity. The findings on GLS's predictive value further underscore the technical soundness of the study, as GLS has been increasingly recognized in recent literature as a significant marker for cardio-oncology assessments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are both sufficient and recent, drawing from significant publications in cardiology and oncology.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though minor grammatical improvements and clarity adjustments could enhance readability. For example, revising sentences to reduce length and adjusting technical terminology for readability would help.	
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:	Rehman Basharat
Department, University & Country	United States