Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CA_125636**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Exploring Cardiac Variability in Hypereosinophilia: Clinical Insights and Echocardiographic Findings**
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 is important to the scientific community as it explores cardiac variability in hypereosinophilia, an under-researched area. The combination of clinical insights and echocardiographic findings provides valuable information for improving diagnosis and treatment. I appreciate its clarity and contribution to the current medical literature.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes it is**	
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 it is**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**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.	**The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive methodology and appropriate use of echocardiographic techniques to evaluate cardiac variability in hypereosinophilia. The authors provide a detailed explanation of patient selection criteria, ensuring that the study population is well-defined and relevant. Additionally, the statistical analyses used to interpret the data are appropriate for the study design, lending credibility to the findings. Overall, the scientific rigor and clarity in the presentation of results make the manuscript reliable and valuable to the field.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**Yes it is**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes it is	
Optional/General comments	No plagiarism is suspected in this manuscript. No, there are no competing interest issues in this manuscript.	

Review Form 3

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:	**Francesco Varchetta**
Department, University & Country	**Pineta Grande Hospital, Italy**